

CHURCH HISTORY

JULY 1980

The Episcopacy and the Gospels (112-153)

John Gordon Bates

The Significance of the Church to God
for Christ

John T. McNeill

Christian Missions in the History
of Oregon

Thomas H. J. Smith

Northwestern Conference and the
Episcopal Church

Episcopal Missions and the Oregon Episcopal Church

G. Wayne Clark

Episcopal Social Philosophy in the Oregon Episcopal Church

Dorothea R. Muller

THE AMERICAN EPISCOPAL CHURCH HISTORY

CHURCH HISTORY

Edited by J. H. NICHOLS and F. A. NORWOOD

with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON (<i>Divinity School, Yale University</i>)	RAY C. PETRY (<i>Divinity School, Duke University</i>)
R. PIERCE BEAVER (<i>Divinity School, University of Chicago</i>)	MATTHEW SPINKA (<i>Hartford Theological Seminary, Emeritus</i>)
ROBERT GRANT (<i>Divinity School, University of Chicago</i>)	WILHELM PAUCK (<i>Union Theological Seminary</i>)
WINTHROP S. HUDSON (<i>Colgate-Rochester Divinity School</i>)	JOHN DILLENBERGER (<i>Divinity School, Drew University</i>)
SIDNEY E. MEAD (<i>Meadville Theological School</i>)	EDWARD A. DOWEY, JR. (<i>Princeton Theological Seminary</i>)

VOL. XXVIII

JUNE, 1959

No. 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE PAPACY AND THE GREEKS (1122-1153) Part I. <i>John Gordon Rowe</i> - - - - -	115
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WORD OF GOD FOR CALVIN <i>John T. McNeill</i> - - - - -	131
CHRISTIAN MISSIONS TO THE INDIANS OF OREGON <i>Thomas E. Jessett</i> - - - - -	147
NINETEENTH CENTURY THEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL INFLUENCES ON ADOLF HARNACK <i>G. Wayne Glick</i> - - - - -	157
THE SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY OF JOSIAH STRONG <i>Dorothea R. Muller</i> - - - - -	183
DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS - - - - -	202
AN INQUIRY INTO COMMUNAL AUTHORITY IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH Charles J. Speel, 2nd	
EASTERN LUTHERANISM IN AMERICAN SOCIETY AND AMERICAN CHRISTIANITY, 1870-1914 Reginald W. Deitz	

CONTENTS

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL, April 17, 1959 -	203
---	-----

BOOK REVIEWS - - - - -	204
------------------------	-----

CROSS, F. M. JR.: <i>The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies</i>	Robert M. Grant
STEVENSON, J., ed.: <i>A New Eusebius</i>	Samuel Laeuchli
ALEXANDER, PAUL J.: <i>The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople</i>	Georges Florovsky
BRUCK, EBERHARD F.: <i>Kirchenväter und Soziales Erbrecht</i>	George H. Williams
CHADWICK, NORA K., ed.: <i>Studies in the Early British Church</i>	Allen Cabaniss
CANTOR, NORMAN F.: <i>Church, Kingship and Lay Investiture in England, 1089-1135</i>	Hayden V. White
NORTON, JOHN: <i>The Answer</i>	Verne D. Morey
SCHLATTER, RICHARD: <i>Richard Baxter and Puritan Politics</i>	James C. Spalding
DAVIES, GODFREY: <i>Essays on the Later Stuarts</i>	J. F. Maclear
DURNBAGH, DONALD, trans.: <i>European Origins of the Brethren</i>	G. Wayne Glick
MCCLOY, SHELBY T.: <i>The Humanitarian Movement in Eighteenth-Century France</i>	Burdette C. Poland
TURNBULL, RALPH G.: <i>Jonathan Edwards The Preacher</i> ..	J. Stafford Weeks
TAPPERT, T. G. AND DOBERSTEIN, J. W., eds.: <i>The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg</i>	E. Theodore Bachmann
WEISBERGER, BERNARD A.: <i>They Gathered at the River, The Story of the Great Revivalists and their Impact upon Religion in America</i>	Winfred E. Garrison
GABRIEL, RALPH: <i>Religion and Learning at Yale: The Church of Christ in the College and University 1757-1957</i>	Walter Wagoner
MULDER, WILLIAM: <i>Homeward to Zion</i>	Gene Lund
McKINNEY, WILLIAM WILSON, ed.: <i>The Presbyterian Valley</i>	J. H. Nichols
POSEY, WALTER BROWNLOW: <i>The Baptist Church in the Lower Mississippi Valley, 1776-1845</i>	Theron D. Price
CROSS, ROBERT D.: <i>The Emergence of Liberal Catholicism in America</i>	Thomas T. McAvoy, C. S. C.
MÜLLER, REINHART: <i>Walter Rauschenbusch</i>	C. Howard Hopkins

THE PAPACY AND THE GREEKS (1122-1153)

JOHN GORDON ROWE

Huron College, University of Western Ontario

It is the peculiar distinction of Steven Runciman to have directed our attention to the importance of the twelfth century in the "hardening" of the schism between the Greek and Latin Churches. In the main, Runciman attributes this unhappy development to those tensions which arose between East and West as a result of the crusades and the establishment of the Latin States in Syria-Palestine.¹ While it is not our intention to question Runciman's arguments, it may be suggested that there are other fruitful approaches to the problem of relations between Rome and Constantinople in the twelfth century which Runciman has touched on only in passing. In general terms, it is the purpose of this article to suggest that the development of the schism must also be understood within the context of a complex political drama, centred on southern Italy, in which the Papacy, the Normans, the Germans and the Greeks were the chief protagonists. Our investigation will be confined to the period extending from the signing of the Concordat of Worms in 1122 to the death of Pope Eugene III in 1153. The purpose of the opening section which follows is: 1) to describe the genesis of this web of conflicting aims and objectives; 2) to indicate in what ways the problem of church union had become woven into the fabric of these political developments; 3) to delineate the various responses, both ecclesiastical and political, which the Papacy made to these new developments in her relations with the Greeks prior to the Second Crusade.²

I

As is well known, the creation by Roger II (1112-1154) of a united kingdom in southern Italy and Sicily transformed the peace established between Papacy and Empire at the Concordat of Worms into a kind of defensive alliance against the Norman monarch. From the moment of his appearance in Italy, Roger had been the overt enemy of the Papacy, inflicting upon the Roman see a series of humiliations which reached its climax in his support of the anti-pope Anacletus II in the papal schism of 1130.³ Further, by his coronation as king at Palermo on Christmas Day of the same year, Roger declared himself indifferent to the claims of the Empire in southern Italy. A basis was thus provided for closer cooperation between the Papacy and the Empire, and the legitimate Pope, Innocent II (1130-1143), found the Emperor Lothair III (1125-1137) willing to make common cause

with him against both Roger and Anacletus. Supported by Innocent and encouraged by Bernard of Clairvaux, Lothair undertook two expeditions into Italy in 1132 and 1137 to defend both Church and Empire against Roger and his anti-pope.⁴

Lothair's expeditions into Italy produced no lasting solution to the problem of Roger. If anything, they served only to reveal a fundamental disagreement between Papacy and Empire as to the proper disposition of the Norman lands. Who was suzerain of southern Italy? Pope, or Emperor? Innocent and Lothair compromised, but that the issue was not settled was plain to both parties.⁵ Indeed, this dispute over suzerainty may explain why Lothair's successor, Emperor Conrad III (1138-1152), showed little concern for the papal situation in Italy *vis à vis* Roger. Not that Conrad had any affection for Roger. At the opening of his reign, Conrad had put down a rebellion by the Welfs, and there is some reason to think that Roger had supported the rebels.⁶ Nevertheless, not even the seditious activity of Roger in Germany could interest Conrad in an Italian expedition. It is true that Conrad had troubles enough at home. Yet it could be suggested that the real root of his reluctance to come to Italy was his memory of the conflict between Lothair and Innocent. Although mindful of his need for support by the Church in Germany, it is possible that Conrad was determined not to use his power to advance papal claims in Italy at the expense of his own.⁷

Unfortunately, Conrad's lack of interest did not deter Innocent. He proceeded against Roger alone and was defeated. By the treaty of San Mignano (July 27, 1139), Innocent recognized Roger's royal title and granted him investiture for his lands.⁸ Equally serious, from the papal point of view, was the fact that Conrad's reaction to the treaty was not so much indignation at the humiliation of the Papacy as open displeasure that, in investing Roger with his lands, the Papacy had ignored the rights of the Empire in southern Italy.⁹ Yet, if the Papacy found itself estranged somewhat from Conrad, it also found that peace was impossible with Roger. Not only was Roger determined to control the Church in his realms without regard to canonical rights and freedoms, he also wished to extend his power at the expense of the Papal States.¹⁰ In the closing months of his pontificate, Innocent attempted therefore to strengthen the papal relationship with the Germans. In this he was supported by Venice, ever fearful that Roger's predominance in Italy might seriously constrain her commercial operations in the Adriatic. There was little result. Conrad steadfastly refused to become involved with the Papacy in Italy.¹¹

The need of the Papacy for Conrad's support was greatly increased at this time by its inability to control Rome. The radical urban

movement, which had developed in northern Italy at the close of the eleventh century, had finally appeared in Rome. In the last year of his reign, Innocent was faced with a revolt in which nobility, bourgeoisie and proletariat united to destroy the papal domination of the city. Inspired by a fantastic dream of reviving the grandeurs of republican Rome, the new commune established itself by force in 1143.¹² Innocent died during the uproar, and his successors, Celestine II (1143-1144) and Lucius II (1144-1145), effected little against the growing power of the Romans. The scandal to all Christendom increased when Lucius died as the result of a wound received while leading an attack on the Capitol. His successor, Eugene III (1145-1153), was forced to leave the city.¹³ As for Roger, he used the rebellion of the commune to advance his own interests. His agents supported the Romans from the very beginning of the rebellion. The Popes were fully aware of such activities. Yet what could they do? If Celestine II had refused to renew the treaty of San Mignano,¹⁴ Lucius II had nevertheless been obliged to accept a truce of seven years with the Norman monarch, hoping thereby to gain Roger's help against the Romans.¹⁵ Such hopes proved illusory. The Papacy learned once again that agreements with Roger worked only to Roger's advantage and to its own humiliation.

Thus, at the beginning of his reign, Eugene found his position rendered intolerable by the hostility of both Roger and the Romans. His only hope of defence against these enemies lay with the Empire. Yet, despite all his efforts,—legations, letters and other stratagems,—Eugene was unable to persuade Conrad to come to Italy.¹⁶ Nevertheless, the Pope refused to lose hope in Conrad as the eventual protector of the Papacy. As proof of this, we have only to mention Eugene's evident displeasure with Conrad's decision to join the Crusade to the East in 1146. To the papal mind, others might go to defend the Latin Orient against the infidel. Conrad's place was in Italy, upholding the honour of the Apostolic See.¹⁷

* * * * *

There was yet another power concerned with these vicissitudes in Italian politics, a power whose ambitions in East and West were fraught with serious consequences for both the Papacy and all of Latin Christendom: the Byzantine Empire. To understand the significance of these ambitions, we must now turn back to trace the relations of the Eastern emperors with the Western powers.

The great military emperor and diplomat, Alexius I Comnenus (1081-1118), had seen clearly that the continued growth of Latin power in Syria-Palestine boded ill for the Byzantine Empire.¹⁸ He knew full well that the strength of his empire depended on the maintenance of Byzantine power in the eastern Mediterranean. Fortunately

for Byzantium, the wisdom of the father was inherited by the son, and the control of the eastern half of the inland sea remained the fundamental objective of the Emperor John Comnenus (1118-1143) in all his dealings with the Latins in East and West.¹⁹ The chief threat to this policy proved, during John's reign, to be Roger of Sicily. That Roger, like Robert Guiscard and Bohemund, dreamed of the conquest of Constantinople, could be clearly seen in the gradual extension of his power in North Africa, in the marriage of his mother Adelaide to Baldwin of Jerusalem and in his attempt to claim the principality of Antioch in 1130.²⁰ To restrain the Norman king was therefore of the greatest urgency. An ally was necessary for the task, and this the Greeks found in the Western Empire. A series of diplomatic negotiations with Lothair III led to an alliance between the emperors of East and West against Roger.²¹ Therefore, when in 1137 Lothair came to Italy, he came not only as the protector of the Papacy but also as the ally of Constantinople. There was, however, a deeper purpose behind these measures taken by John for the defence of his Empire. The Greeks had never accepted the loss of southern Italy. The destruction of Roger would bring nearer the day when Byzantium might consider seriously the possibility of re-establishing her rule there. Naturally, this deeper purpose was kept well hidden from the Germans who, as we know, considered southern Italy to be within the Western Empire.²²

Parallel to his diplomacy in the West, and strikingly illustrative of his determination to strengthen Byzantine hegemony in the eastern Mediterranean, were the two expeditions which John made against Antioch in 1137-1138 and 1142. The legal basis for Byzantium's claim to Antioch had been established once and for all by the treaty of Devol which Alexius Comnenus had forced on Bohemund of Antioch after the conclusion of the latter's inglorious war against the Empire in 1108.²³ However, the successors of Bohemund at Antioch had refused to acknowledge Byzantine rights, and it was clear that only force would make them do so. When therefore the alliance with the Germans seemed to offer the greatest possibilities for dealing effectively with Roger, John and his army swept down on Antioch, seeking its incorporation into the Empire as a vassal state. While John attained only partial success, it was clear that he was intent on having Antioch as his own.²⁴

As for the East-West alliance, it was continued by the Greeks with Lothair's successor, Conrad. In 1140, John betrothed his son, Manuel Comnenus, to Conrad's niece, Bertha of Sulzbach, and the two emperors re-affirmed their alliance against Roger in 1142. So dangerous did Roger think these developments that he attempted to counter the proposed marriage between Manuel and Bertha by sug-

gesting a marriage which would unite his own royal house with the imperial family of Byzantium. This proposal reached Constantinople immediately after Manuel had ascended the imperial throne, John having died in a hunting accident in Cilicia, and there is some reason to think that Manuel toyed with Roger's suggestion. Yet, when his dealings with Roger led only to a serious humiliation for the Greeks, Manuel turned back to the policy of his predecessors. He re-affirmed both his betrothal to Bertha and the alliance with Conrad against Roger. Whatever insults Manuel was forced to swallow during these negotiations, Roger's hostility made it impossible for him to dispense with the German alliance. The union between East and West was consummated in the marriage of Manuel and Bertha in January 1146, and it is even possible that the same year might have seen a concerted attack on Roger by the Germans and the Greeks had not the Second Crusade intervened.²⁵

His marriage to Bertha, together with his vindication of his claims to suzerainty over Antioch, indicate that Manuel wished to continue the policies of his father. However, it should be pointed out that Manuel's ambitions surpassed those of his cautious predecessor. On the one hand, Manuel intended to establish his power fully in Antioch, hoping to strengthen his position against the Turks and to increase his influence over the Latins in the East. On the other hand, he sought both the destruction of Roger and the actual restoration of Byzantine rule in southern Italy and Sicily. If this could be achieved, the Byzantine control of the eastern Mediterranean would be assured. Further, when to these dreams there was joined yet another ambition, i.e., the incorporation of Hungary into the Byzantine sphere of influence and rule, we can better appreciate the scope of Manuel's determination to vindicate the Byzantine claims to universal hegemony and thus revive the glories of Justinian. Indeed, the final goal in this magnificent vision of power was the union of the imperial crowns of East and West in Manuel's person. It was this grandiose project which dictated that aspect of Manuel's policy which so impressed his contemporaries: his fondness for Latins and all things Latin. However, behind his genuine appreciation of Latin civilization there was policy. In the newly enlarged empire, the throne of Byzantium must transcend the limits of race, language and culture. Greek and Latin must meet on an equal footing before the imperial majesty.

In conclusion, we need only to point out that with all these ambitions for the exaltation of Byzantium in East and West, the Papacy was perforce involved, whether as a political power in Italy or as the spiritual arbiter of Latin Christendom and the bestower of the imperial crown of the West. That the complete affirmation of Byzantine

claims to universal sovereignty required church union with Rome was never hidden from Manuel's vision.²⁶

* * * * *

Thus in the generation prior to the Second Crusade, the Byzantine Empire and its activities had become increasingly important for Latin Christendom in both East and West. Byzantine ambition was now inextricably woven, not only into the life of the Latin Orient, but also into the conflicts and tensions of Italy and the Western Empire. Yet, what response did Byzantine ambition elicit from the Papacy, and how did these complicated developments in the secular sphere influence ecclesiastical relations between Rome and Constantinople? To answer these questions, we must turn back once more to the beginning of the twelfth century.

In the first place, we may begin by recalling the mutual animosity which the Crusades of 1096 and 1101 had created between Greeks and Latins. In the West, our sources enable us to follow the growth of that anti-Greek sentiment which was to reach its ferocious climax in the Fourth Crusade.²⁷ And, by way of reply, there are those flights of horrified rhetoric used by Anna Comnena in her description of the Papacy.²⁸ Just how virulent this Greek resentment of the West and of the Papacy in particular could be was revealed by a member of the Greek legation to Lothair III during his second Italian campaign of 1137. Without provocation, the ambassador publicly arraigned Latin Christendom in head and members. If he declared the Western Church excommunicate for its addition of the "Filioque" clause to the Creed, his choicest invective was reserved for the Papacy, which he described as an institution devoted to worldliness, warmongering and militarism. It is probable that this spontaneous attack on the Roman Church became known to Innocent II, and unfortunately the Pope had no way of knowing that such a violent attitude was not an accurate representation of the feelings of many Greek churchmen.²⁹

This attack, together with the evident Byzantine interest in Italian affairs, must have induced Innocent II to reflect on the problem of the Greeks. Quite probably, he recalled that years before, Alexius Comnenus had proposed himself to Paschal II as a candidate for the imperial crown of the West. For good measure Alexius also interjected the possibility of church union into the discussion. However, it had been clear to the Papacy at that time that Alexius' proposals were designed to strengthen Byzantine prestige in southern Italy where the Greeks still had many friends.³⁰ Innocent therefore might well be fearful that the Greek concern for Roger's destruction was but the prelude to an attempt on their part to reconquer southern Italy. If such occurred, the Papacy would lose its suzerainty over the Normans, and

the spiritual and temporal independence of the Roman Church might be seriously threatened. Yet what could the Papacy do? What protest could she make to Lothair, seeing that the Greeks were Lothair's allies and that Lothair himself was the only defence the Papacy had against Roger and Anacletus? Besides, it is quite probable that Innocent was far more concerned to restrain the Normans than to complain to Lothair over Byzantine ambitions in southern Italy.³¹

In the midst of these reflections, the news arrived in Rome that the Emperor John Comnenus had descended on Antioch to claim that principality for his own. This clear manifestation of Byzantium's ambitious designs provoked Innocent to action. Anxious to defend the Latin Orient and the claims of the Latin Church to the patriarchal see of Antioch, Innocent issued on March 28, 1138, a letter directed to all Latins serving in John's army. Denouncing John as excommunicate, the Pope threatened with the same ban any Latin who dared to serve in the Greek army. The letter was implicitly a denial of the Greek claims to Antioch and an even more forceful defiance of the Byzantine Empire and the Greek Church.³²

Yet this was not the only response which Innocent made to the Byzantine challenge. Strongly worded letters might be calculated to strengthen Latin resistance in Antioch to Byzantine claims. However, it was unlikely they would have any effect on the Greeks themselves. A more positive approach must be made to the problem. Whatever the outcome of the campaign in Cilicia, it was clear that the Byzantine star was in the ascendant over Antioch, and there was also every possibility that the Byzantine interest in Italy would be maintained through the renewal of the East-West alliance. Yet how to limit the Greek ambitions in East and West? The most satisfactory method of meeting the Byzantine challenge on all fronts was the achievement of church union. If the Greeks could accept papal supremacy, the *sine qua non* of any such union, then the political rights of the Papacy in Italy as well as the ecclesiastical rights of the Latin Church in Antioch might be secured. Accordingly, a few months after his letter of March, 1138, Innocent boldly sent off an embassy to John Comnenus. To our great loss, only two imperial letters remain to tell us of the course of the negotiations which followed, and, unfortunately, what information they contain is often obscured by a cloud of rhetoric. Nonetheless, it is clear that Innocent pleaded with John for the reunion of the churches, and for harmonious relations between himself and the Greek monarch. John responded in friendly fashion to this appeal. Twice he returned Innocent's embassy with one of his own. However, for all his friendliness, John contributed little to the discussions, taking care always to leave the Papacy with the responsibility for continuing the negotiations.³³

Thus no positive result emerged from these exchanges. After John's second legation in 1142, we know of no further negotiation. Why did these discussions fail? No definite answer can be given. However, we may be certain that both parties were well aware of the issues involved in their discussions of church union. In his first reply, John had alluded to his activities against the Turks in the East, "where the most Christian Latins are."³⁴ And when Innocent in his second letter had argued for the necessity of union between the spiritual and the temporal powers, it was clear that the Papacy was attempting to impose certain limits on Byzantine ambitions in East and West.³⁵ It is possible therefore that John, wishing to retain his freedom of operation with regard to Antioch and southern Italy, deliberately made his replies friendly but inconclusive. Perhaps Innocent therefore concluded that the matter was hopeless and allowed the negotiations to die a natural death. On the other hand, it may well be that Innocent took fright at the possible consequences of a reconciliation with the Greeks, especially in the form of reprisals from Roger of Sicily. Perhaps too the Greek ambassadors demanded something which the Papacy refused to give, i.e., the imperial crown of the West. Perhaps even the Papacy took umbrage at some of the theological phrases concerning the constitution of the Church which John used in his letters.³⁶ For whatever reason, Innocent failed to achieve church union, and relations between Rome and Constantinople remained at an impasse.³⁷

Nonetheless, this failure could not be regarded as final. The Greeks continued active in the vicinity of Antioch and adamant in their claim of suzerainty over that principality. Of their activities, Eugene III received first-hand information from Hugh, Bishop of Jabala, in December, 1145.³⁸ Closer to home and more serious for the Papacy was the fact that the re-affirmation of the East-West alliance by Conrad and Manuel augured a joint attack in the near future on Roger of Sicily. The Papacy could no longer be indifferent to the Byzantine challenge in East and West, and more and more, that challenge was centred around southern Italy. It can therefore be suggested that Eugene understood full well that a reconciliation between Rome and Byzantium was a matter of the greatest importance. What had been for decades a spiritual goal, devoutly desired for its own sake, was now rapidly becoming a political necessity. Perhaps Eugene found encouragement in the thought that the new emperor Manuel might prove more tractable than his predecessors in healing the schism. Yet how was a successful approach to be made? As we shall see, the Second Crusade was to provide the Papacy with its great opportunity.³⁹

II

Our next task is an analysis of Eugene's attempt to heal the

schism during the Second Crusade. Yet it must be understood that the possibility of reconciliation with the Greeks had little to do with the papal decision to summon the crusade.⁴⁰ To be sure, when Eugene heard that the preaching of Bernard of Clairvaux at Vézelay had made the crusade a *fait accompli*, he wrote at once to Manuel of Constantinople. However, his purpose in writing at this time was solely to solicit the good-will and assistance of the Greek Emperor for the crusaders.⁴¹ It was only during the months following that certain developments stimulated in Eugene's mind the conviction that the crusade would offer an excellent opportunity for healing the schism.

The first of these developments was Roger of Sicily's manifest desire to turn the crusade into a weapon which his own ambitions might use against the Byzantine Empire. With this in mind, Roger attempted to persuade the French to pass through his realm on their way to the East rather than through Greek territory. Fortunately, his offers of hospitality and assistance were rejected by the French at the council of Étampes (February 16, 1147), and the French accepted instead the Greek offers of aid and counsel. An alliance with Roger was correctly judged to be undesirable, despite all that Roger's ambassadors, together with some of the French, might say concerning the record of Greek "perfidy" to the crusaders in the past. The French were aware that Roger's designs on Syria-Palestine had earned him the cordial hatred of the Latin Orient. They also knew that on Christmas Day, 1146, Conrad III of Germany had taken the cross. The French saw that the crusade would be doomed from the start if they chose to ally themselves with Conrad's enemy. Besides, Roger's long-standing enmity with the Papacy disqualified him as a suitable partner on the crusade.⁴²

Roger's activities must have created in the mind of Eugene no little concern for the influence which Roger might have on the actual course of the expedition. Forty years before, another Norman, Bohemund of Antioch, had turned the crusade into a war of aggression against the Greeks. The results had been most damaging to relations between Greeks and Latins. Yet how to prevent another misuse of the crusade and a further deterioration in relations between the two halves of Christendom? This was the new problem which Roger's ambitions now presented to the Papacy. However, it was not until the spring of 1147 that Eugene discovered a possible solution to this problem in the fact that the crusade might offer excellent prospects for the healing of the schism between the Greek and Latin Churches.⁴³

For the Greeks, the passage of the crusaders through their territories was anything but an occasion for rejoicing, offering as it did the prospect of heavy damage to the realm and even constituting a

serious threat to the very existence of the Empire itself.⁴⁴ Therefore, in his first letter to Eugene in August, 1146, Manuel Comnenus, in promising to assist the crusaders in their undertaking, had sought papal friendship, hoping thereby to gain some measure of protection for his Empire in the difficult months ahead. Indeed, as time went by, Manuel's anxieties increased, if only because he also knew of Roger's negotiations with the French. He therefore wrote again to Eugene in March, 1147, re-iterating in the strongest terms his concern for his Empire and imploring papal supervision of the armies which were to pass through his realm. Yet what must have caught the papal attention here was Manuel's express desire that he and the Papacy draw together into "greater union and concord" for the benefit of all Christians. Perhaps now there would be greater readiness on the part of the Greeks to listen to papal proposals for church union. Could not the Byzantine fear of the crusaders be made to work in favor of such a plan? If so, here was the answer to Roger's desire to direct the crusade against Constantinople. If the Greeks were reconciled to the Latin Church, they were no longer the enemies of Latin Christendom, and it would be difficult for Roger to persuade the faithful to join in an attack on Constantinople. Here, too, was a possible solution to those problems which Byzantine ambition in East and West had posed for the Papacy.⁴⁵

Yet it is a great testimony to Eugene's acumen that he saw what Innocent had failed to see: that the East-West alliance might be used to heal the schism. Beyond question, this profound insight was prompted by the realization that since Conrad had taken the cross, both he and Manuel would be thrown together during the course of the crusade. Would not Manuel regard church union with a more favourable eye if such were urged on him by his all-important ally, Conrad of Germany? Eugene acted at once to put his plan into effect.

It is important to note that the task of the healing of the schism was not given to the Cardinals Theodwin and Guy who were commissioned as papal legates to travel with the crusading armies.⁴⁶ Undoubtedly, the legates knew Eugene's hopes. However, their contribution was, in this matter, to be more indirect. Their duty was to earn good-will for the Latins through the prevention of direct attacks on the Byzantine Empire by any of the crusaders and also to mitigate the damage which the armies would inflict on Manuel's realm during their march towards the East. As for the church union, Eugene turned elsewhere. On July 15, 1147, he wrote to Henry, Bishop of Moravia, a stalwart supporter of papal policies in Germany and a close advisor of Conrad. Eugene urged Henry to use his influential position with Conrad to the end that Conrad himself might work for the union of

the churches. Thus the East-West alliance was to be the effective agent in healing the breach between Rome and Constantinople.⁴⁷

Unfortunately, Eugene soon discovered that Henry had elected to join the crusade against the Slavs rather than the long journey to Jerusalem. He therefore sent another letter. While the Pope felt that he could not rescind Henry's decision to stay in the West, he did indicate just how much he had hoped that Henry would create in Conrad's mind a deeper realization of the need for the healing of the schism. Now that prospect was gone. Eugene made it quite plain that if Henry did not go to the East, it was his judgment that nothing further could be done in the matter of church union.⁴⁸

The papal attempt to heal the schism ended then and there. Attempts to discuss church union with the Greeks during the Second Crusade are not recorded in the documents. It may be that Theodwin and Guy, knowing of Eugene's hopes, attempted to do something. If so, they must have found themselves hampered by their ineffectiveness as legates and also by the fact that the suspicion and hatred which the Greeks and Latins felt for each other during the passage of the armies through the Byzantine Empire were such as to render any talk of church union a waste of time.⁴⁹

Yet the question remains as to why Eugene felt obliged to drop his plan so quickly, once he had seen that he could not use the East-West alliance to achieve his goal. Why did he not proceed on his own, assuming that the Greek fear of Roger and the crusaders was such that Manuel would feel obliged to listen to papal proposals, quite apart from any exhortations which Conrad could have delivered on this matter? Perhaps Eugene, like Innocent before him, realized that church union with the Greeks might open the Papacy to reprisals from Roger of Sicily. The Norman threat to papal security in Italy must have seemed most dangerous at this time since with Conrad's departure to the East, the Papacy had no possible protector against Roger. As it was, the Pope was to spend much of the time during the crusade in France, far away from Roger and the Romans. Perhaps Eugene feared that, if the union negotiations failed, such would provide an excuse for Roger and others to attack the Byzantine Empire.⁵⁰ However, another answer could be made to the question. It may be that the Pope regarded the East-West alliance as the only profitable means of healing the schism. Innocent had tried to pursue church union without utilizing any political mechanism, such as the alliance between Conrad and Manuel, and he had received nothing for his trouble. However, if Conrad were spokesman for the Papacy, the Greeks would not dare to frustrate the papal desire for union by demanding as a reward the imperial crown of the West or the recognition by the Papacy of By-

zantine claims in southern Italy. To do so would be to destroy the alliance with Conrad. On the other hand, if Conrad were not available to support the papal scheme, would not the Greeks make these proposals to Eugene as, we have suggested, John had done with Innocent? The negotiations would therefore be as fruitless as before. It is for this reason, we would suggest, that Eugene therefore dropped his project of church union when he found that he could not achieve the healing of the schism within the context, and through the agency of, the East-West alliance.

(to be continued)

1. S. Runciman, *The Eastern Schism* (Oxford, 1955), *passim*, esp., 100-101. See also P. Charanis, "Aims of the Medieval Crusades and how they were viewed by Byzantium," *Church History*, XXI (1952), 123-134. This excellent article is curiously absent from Runciman's bibliography.
2. The following abbreviations are used throughout this article: MGH SS = *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores*, ed., G. H. Pertz and others; RHF = *Recueil des historiens des Gaules et de la France*, ed., M. Bouquet and others; RISS (old) = *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, ed., L. A. Muratori; RISS (new) = new edition of RISS (old) by G. Carducci and others; PL = *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*, ed., J. P. Migne; RHCoe = *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Historiens Occidentaux*, ed., under the direction of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres; JL = *Regesta pontificum Romanorum*, ed., P. Jaffé, S. Loewenfeld and others; DR = F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches* (being Reihe A, Abt. I of *Corpus der griechischen Urkunden des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit*, 3 vols., Munich-Berlin, 1924-1932); MOIG = *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung*; WE = Wibald of Corbie, *Epistolae*, ed. P. Jaffé, in v. 1 of his *Bibliotheca rerum Germanicarum* (Berlin, 1864).
3. Principal sources for these events are: Fule of Benevento, PL, 173, 1197-1205; Alexander Telesinus, RISS (old), V, 617-619; Romuald of Salerno, RISS (new), VII, I, 216-220, who garbles his report, hoping thereby to hide the true character of Norman aggression; JL, 8411, 8413 and I, p. 832. Indispensable for the history of the Normans in southern Italy are E. Caspar, *Roger II. und die Gründung der normannisch-sicilischen Monarchie* (Innsbruck, 1904); F. Chalandon, *Histoire de la domination normande en Italie et en Sicile* (2 vols., Paris, 1907); E. Curtis, *Roger of Sicily and the Normans in Lower Italy, 1016-1154*. (New York-London, 1912), a work leaning heavily upon Caspar and Chalandon; W. Cohn, *Das Zeitalter der Normannen in Sizilien* (Bonn, 1920).
4. Peter the Deacon, MGH SS, VII, 811; Bernard, *Epistolae*, 129, 139, PL, 182, 283-285, 293-295; Romuald of Salerno, RISS(new), VII, I, 221-222. The German sources are collected in W. Bernhardt, *Lothar von Supplinburg* (Leipzig, 1879), 42ff. For further papal activity against Roger, see the sources for the council at Pisa, collected in C. J. Hefele, *Histoire des Conciles*, trans. and ed., H. Leclercq (10 vols. in 19, Paris, 1907-1931), V, I, 706f; P. Kehr, *Italia Pontificia* (8 vols. in 10, Rome, 1906-1935), VIII, 39f. Note that for convenience I shall refer to all rulers of the Empire as "emperor" whether crowned as such or not.
5. The Italian sources reflect the tension between Pope and Emperor: Romuald, RISS(new), VII, I, 223-224; Peter the Deacon, MGH SS, VII, 820. However, H. Gleber, *Papst Eugen III* (Jena, 1936), 6-8, the best monograph on its subject, neglects to take this into consideration with the result that his presentation of papal-imperial relations with regard to the Normans in the middle of the twelfth century leaves something to be desired. Nor does Chalandon, *op.cit.*, II, 71 emphasize this sufficiently. On the other hand, J. Haller, *Das Papsttum. Idee und Wirklichkeit* (5 vols., 2nd ed., Stuttgart, 1950-1953), III, 51, and A. Fliche, R. Foreville and J. Rousset, *Du premier Concile du Latran à l'Avènement d'Innocent III* (being IX, I, of *Histoire de l'Eglise*, ed., A. Fliche and others, Paris, 1948), 67, are fully aware of the problem. In this, they follow Bernhardt, *op.cit.*,

- 701, 715-732, 745-747, 755f. For the original papal treaty with the Normans in 1059, see A. Fliche, *La réforme grégorienne* (3 vols., Paris 1924-1927), I, 328-330, or, better, J. Gay, *L'Italie méridionale et l'Empire byzantin* (Paris 1904), 516-519. That Innocent was determined not to abandon his claims is clear from JL, 7848.
6. Whether or not Roger enters the cross-currents of German history at this point depends on our dating of the evidence in the following: Godfrey of Viterbo, MGH SS, XXII, 260-261; *Hist. Welf. Weingart.*, MGH SS, XXI, 468; *Ann. Herm. Althenses*, MGH SS, XVII, 381. See P. Rassow, *Honor imperii* (Monaco, 1940), 32f.
 7. W. Bernhart, *Konrad III.* (Leipzig, 1883), 179-181.
 8. Fule of Benevento, PL, 173, 1249-1253; JL, 8043. For a discussion of the treaty of San Mignano, see P. Kehr, "Die Belehnungen der süditalienischen Normannenfürsten durch die Päpste (1059-1192)", *Abd. d. Preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl.* (1934), 1-52, cf. here 42-43.
 9. An echo of Conrad's resentment of Innocent's action may be seen in Bernard, *Epistolae*, 183, PL, 182, 345. For the dating of this letter, Bernhart, *Konrad III.*, 180, and B. S. James, *The Letters of St. Bernard of Clairvaux* (London, 1953), 304-305.
 10. Chalandon, *op. cit.*, II, 108-112, exaggerates perhaps Roger's control of the Church in his realm. See E. Jordan, "La politique ecclésiastique de Roger Ier et les origines de la 'legation sicilienne'", *Moyen Age*, ser. 2, XXIV (1922), 237-273, XXV (1923), 32-65. For continued trouble on the papal-Norman frontier, see John of Salisbury, *Historia Pontificalis*, XXXII, ed., R. L. Poole (Oxford, 1937), 66-68.
 11. Otto of Freising, *Gesta Friderici*, I, 25, MGH SS in usu schol., XLVI, ed., G. Waitz (1912), 39. For general observations on Venetian policy, G. Ostrogorsky, *A History of the Byzantine State*, trans., J. Hussey (Oxford, 1956), 317.
 12. The Roman revolt attracted considerable attention from contemporary writers, egs., Otto of Freising, *Chronicon*, VII, 27, MGH SS in usu schol., XLV, ed., A. Hofmeister (1912), 352-354; John of Salisbury, XXVII, 60; Godfrey of Viterbo, MGH SS, XXII, 261; Romuald of Salerno, RISS(new), VII, I, 227-228. A brief treatment of these developments may be found in R. Folz, *L'idée d'Empire en Occident du Ve au XIVe siècle* (Paris, 1953), 102-109, and Gleber, *op. cit.*, 5-33, whose treatment of Arnold of Brescia should be compared with A. Frugoni, *Arnaldo da Brescia nelle fonti del sec. XII* (Roma, 1954). The bibliography on Rome in the Middle Ages is extensive. A good introduction to the literature may be found in Folz. Especially pertinent at this point are A. Graf, *Roma nella memoria e nelle immaginazioni nel Medio Evo* (Torino, 1923), 54f.; E. Dupré-Theseider, *L'Idée imperiale di Roma nella tradizione de Medioevo* (Milano, 1942), 37-41, 123-137; P. Brezzi, *Roma e l'impero medievale* (Bologna, 1948), 332-337; M. A. Schoenian, *Der Idee der Volkssouveränität im mittelalterlichen Rom* (Leipzig, 1919), 46-62.
 13. JL, 8714; *Liber Pontificalis*, ed., L. Duchesne (2 vols., Paris, 1886-1892), II, 386; Bernhart, *Konrad III.*, 451-453.
 14. Gleber, *op. cit.*, 7-8, omits this, presenting an inadequate picture of the papal dilemma with Rome and Sicily. However, decisive evidence may be found in Romuald, RISS(new), VII, I, 227; *Ex chronicis Haugustaldensibus*, MGH SS, XXVII, 143; the chronicler of St. Mary's of Ferrara, ed., A. Gaudenzi, in *Monumenti storici. Società napoletane di storia patria. Series I. Chronache* (Naples, 1888), 27.
 15. Lucius seems to have made a fruitless appeal to Conrad. See JL, 8684. As for his treaty with Roger, the account in Chalandon, *op. cit.*, II, 113-115, is to be preferred to Gleber, *loc. cit.* That this treaty was but a temporary truce between deadly enemies is proved by the wording of JL, 8653, PL, 179, 905.
 16. During the opening months of Eugene's reign, Bernard of Clairvaux attempted to assist the Pope in his relations with Conrad. See his *Epistolae*, 243, 244, PL, 182, 437-442. The dating of these letters has occasioned some discussion. Bernhart, *Konrad III.*, 459-460 and James, *op. cit.*, 391-395, correctly place these letters here whereas Fliche, Foreville and Rousset do not, *op. cit.*, 87, n. 8.
 17. For Conrad's decision to go to the East, see WE, 33, pp. 111-112. An indispensable tool in using this great collection of letters is H. Zatschek, "Wibald von Stablo. Studien zur Reichskanzlei und Reichspolitik unter den älteren Staufern", *MOIG, Ergänzungsband*, I (1928), 237-495, ref. here 325. See also Virginia E. Berry's treatment in her chapter on the Second Crusade in K. M. Setton, ed., *A History of the Crusades, I: The First Hundred Years*, ed., M. W. Baldwin (Philadelphia, 1955), 476-477. Notable also is G. Constable, "The Second

- Crusade as seen by Contemporaries," *Traditio*, IX (1953), 213-279, for its splendid bibliographical information, ref. here, 278-279. As Gleber, *op.cit.*, 48, 53, reminds us, the papal crusade bulls *Quantum praedecessores nostri* and *Divina dispensatione* were directed to France and Italy respectively, and not to Germany.
18. See the sentiments attributed to him on his deathbed, P. Maas, "Die Musen des Kaiser Alexios I," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, XXII (1913), 357-358, lines 328-329.
 19. This continuity of policy is admirably treated by Ostrogorsky, *op.cit.*, 337, and P. Lamma, *Comneni e Stauffer* (2 vols., Rome, 1955-1957), I, 20f. Particularly illuminating in this regard were the attempts made to preserve Byzantine commercial supremacy on the sea by pursuing a policy of "divide and rule" with Genoa, Pisa and Venice. See DR, II, 1253, 1254, 1310, 1312, 1332. The sources and standard authorities are summarized in these entries. Significantly, in the opening years of his reign, John Comnenus tried unsuccessfully to reduce the great position which Venice occupied within Byzantine economy. See F. Chalandon, *Jean Comnène (1118-1143) et Manuel Comnène (1143-1180)* (being the second volume of *Les Comnènes*, Paris, 1912), 156f; A. Kretschmayr, *Geschichte von Venedig* (3 vols., Gotha, 1905-1920), I, 224-229; DR, II, 1304; J. Danstrup, "Manuel's Coup against Genoa and Venice in the Light of Byzantine Commercial Policy," *Classica et Medievalia*, X (1949), 195-219, esp., 203-204.
 20. The Greeks perceived the dangerous character of Norman ambitions with great clarity. See John Cinnamus, *Epitome Historiarum*, II, 4, ed., J. Meineke (Bonn, 1836), 37. For Roger's designs on the Latin Orient, see William of Tyre, *Historia rerum in partibus transmarinis gestarum*, XI, 29, XIV, 9, 20, RHCoc, I, 506, 619, 635-636. F. Gerone treats the evidence dealing with Norman expansion in North Africa. See his *L'opera politica e militare di Ruggiero II in Africa ed in Oriente* (Catania, 1913), *passim*.
 21. Considerable attention has been given to the relations between the empires of East and West in the High Middle Ages. Good bibliographical directions may be found in K. J. Heilig, "Ostrom und das Deutsche Reich um die Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts," in T. Mayer, K. J. Heilig, and C. Erdmann, *Kaisertum und Herzogsgewalt im Zeitalter Friedrichs I.*, MGH *Schriften*, IX (Stuttgart, 1944) 1-271, *rf.* here 147-148, n.1; also W. Ohnsorge, *Das Zweikaiserproblem im früheren Mittelalter* (Hildesheim, 1947), 140.
 22. These diplomatic exchanges are recorded, together with citation of the pertinent sources, in DR, II, 1309, 1313. The best treatment here remains Chalandon, *Jean et Manuel*, 164f. For an interesting account of the chief of the German delegation to Constantinople, see J. Dräseke, "Bischof Anselm von Havelberg und seine Gesandtschaftsreisen nach Byzanz," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, XXI (1900-1901), 160-185, and G. Schreiber, "Anselm von Havelberg und die Ostkirche," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, LX (1942), 357-411. Heilig, *op.cit.*, 135, n.1 has good bibliographical directions for Anselm.
 23. The treaty is found in Anna Comnena, *Alexiad*, ed., B. Leib (3 vols., Paris, 1937-1945), III, 125-137. Of especial merit are Heilig's comments on this treaty, *op.cit.*, 125-128.
 24. The best general account of John's dealings with Antioch is C. Cahen, *La Syrie du Nord à l'Époque des Croisades* (Paris, 1940), 347-366. For a brief introduction to the relation between the Greeks and the Latin Orient, see John LaMonte, "To what extent was the Byzantine Empire the Suzerain of the Crusading States?" *Byzantion*, VII (1932), 253-264.
 25. DR, II, 1320-1322, 1338 lists the sources for the negotiations which culminated in the marriage of Irene and Manuel. Chalandon, *Jean et Manuel*, 169f, 209-211, 258-262 disentangles the evidence preserved chiefly by Otto of Freising, *Chronicon*, VII, 28, p. 355, and *Gesta Friderici*, I, 25, pp. 37-43. See also Cinnamus, II, 4, pp. 36-38 and Nicetas Choniates, *Historia de Manuele Comneno*, I, 2, ed., I. Bekker (Bonn, 1835), 72-73. Some light on this evidence is cast by G. Vernadskij, "Relations byzantino-russes au XII^e siècle," *Byzantion*, IV (1927-1928), 269-279, esp., 272. For Manuel's abortive negotiations with Roger, see DR, II, 1331. This is recorded chiefly by Cinnamus, III, 2, pp. 91-92. See Chalandon's penetrating critique of this evidence in *Domination normande*, II, 127-129, and *Jean et Manuel*, 172-173, 258-259. The "difficulties" alluded to in the text were fundamentally a conflict in ideologies between German and Greek notions of empire. The Greek scorn for German "pretensions" may be seen in Cinnamus, V, 7, pp. 218-220, and the correspondence, preserved in Otto, *supra*, reveals the mutual fear, jealousy and suspicion of both parties. See W. Ohnsorge, "'Kaiser' Konrad III.," *MOIG*, XLVI (1932), 343-361,

- and his *Zweikaiserproblem*, 97f; E. Back, "Imperium Romanum," *Classica et Mediaevalia*, VII (1945), 138-149; F. Dölger, "Die 'Familie der Könige' im Mittelalter," in his *Byzanz und die Europäische Staatenwelt* (Ettal, 1953), 34-69.
26. Manuel's dramatic vindication of his rights over Antioch may be seen in Cinnamus, II, 1-3, pp. 29-35; Nicetas, *De Manuele*, I, 2, pp. 71-72; Michael the Syrian, *Chronicle*, ed., J. B. Chabot (4 vols., Paris, 1899-1910), III, 267. Echoes of Byzantine dreams for an Empire "restored" in East and West may be found throughout the writings of the Greek historians. See Cinnamus, V, 7, VI, 9, pp. 218, 278. For his description of Roger as a "tyrant," II, 4, p. 37; Nicetas, *De Joanne VII*, XI, XII, 36, 52, 56, *De Manuele*, II, 8, VII, 1-2, pp. 130-131, pp. 259-268. Writing as he did in the light of the disaster of 1204, Nicetas was deeply critical of Manuel's policies which, he felt, were instrumental in bringing about the debacle. Secondary treatments of Manuel's policies are numerous, from H. von Kap-Herr, *Die abendländische Politik Kaiser Manuels* (Strasburg, 1881), *passim*, esp., 109-116, to Heilig, *op.cit.*, 150f; Ohnsorge, *Zweikaiserproblem*, 90-91, 104; Lamma, *op.cit.*, I, 45f. Manuel's "western flair" is excellently described in Ch. Diehl, *La Société byzantine à l'époque des Comnènes* (Paris, 1919), 13f.
 27. Primary sources for the growth of anti-Byzantine sentiment in Western Europe are the *Anonymi Gesta Francorum*, ed., L. Bréhier (Paris, 1924) and the *Hierosolymita* of Ekkehard, RHCoe, V, I.
 28. See Runciman, *op.cit.*, 110-113 for an excellent treatment of Anna.
 29. Peter the Deacon, MGH SS, VII, 833.
 30. DR, II, 1261-1264; JL, 6334, PL, 163, 388-389; JL, I, 747-748.
 31. J. Drüske, *op.cit.* (*supra*, n. 22), 164, suggested that the German representative in the East-West negotiations of 1135-1137, Anselm of Havelberg, was specially commissioned to discuss problems pertaining to church union. It is true that Anselm did discuss mooted points of faith and practise with an eminent Greek theologian. See his *Dialogi*, PL, 188. However, it is most unlikely that the Papacy was connected in any way with the negotiations of the two Empires at this time.
 32. JL, 7883, PL, 179, 354-355.
 33. The letters are printed in A. Theiner and E. Miklosich, *Monumenta spectantia ad unionem Ecclesiarum Graecae et Romanae* (Vienna, 1872), 1-6.
- A more modern edition may be found in Sp. Lampros, "Autokratorōn tou Buzantiou chrusoboulla kai chrusa grammata anapheromena eis tēn henosin tōn ekklesiōn," *Neos Hellēnomnōn*, XI (1914), 109-11. They present serious difficulties in dating. DR, II, 1302-1303, dates them, 1124-1126, following W. Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz* (Berlin, 1903), 90-91, and Chalandon, *Jean et Manuel*, 51. Runciman, *op.cit.*, 114 continues this interpretation. However, I have followed J. Haller, *op.cit.*, III, 499-500, and Ostrogorsky, *op.cit.*, 341-342, who accept the dates 1139-1141 as does Ohnsorge, *Zweikaiserproblem*, 89-90. That John explains his delay in answering the first papal letter as caused by his wars on the Turks in the vicinity of Antioch suggests that the letter was written shortly after his return to Constantinople in 1139.
34. Theiner and Miklosich, *op.cit.*, 2: "...hōs tou hēmeterou... kai autois tois christianikōtatois Latinois tois echeise,..."
 35. Theiner and Miklosich, *op.cit.*, 4: "Duo tauta diērēmēna pragmata peripasan tēn kath' hēmas politeian ho logos egnōrisen,..."
 36. Can the phrase, Theiner and Miklosich, *op.cit.*, 2, referring to the constitution of the Church, "...en tē petra tēs pisteōs dia tōn apostolōn" be accidental?
 37. Ostrogorsky, *op.cit.*, 341-342, rightly criticizes Chalandon's failure to perceive the political interests of John Comnenus in these negotiations. On the other hand, he fails to appreciate the motives behind Innocent's overtures towards Constantinople. He even neglects to note that it was Innocent who opened the negotiations. Lamma, *op.cit.*, I, 28-30, unfortunately adds little to our understanding of these letters. Ohnsorge, *Zweikaiserproblem*, 89-90, briefly refers to these exchanges, arguing that the Papacy was attempting to create a three-way alliance between itself, Conrad and Manuel, against Roger. This is a tantalizing suggestion. However, there is no evidence to support the notion that Innocent wished to become a third party in the East-West alliance, and secondly, it must not be forgotten that the concern of Innocent here was for something far greater than Byzantine support against Roger, i.e., the defence of the claims of the Roman Church against the Byzantine designs on Antioch and southern Italy.
 38. Otto of Freising, *Chronicon*, VII, 28, 32, 33, pp. 354, 360-364.

39. Gleber, *op.cit.*, 36-37, following Otto, *Chronicon*, VII, 32, recounts the visit to Eugene at this time by an embassy from the Armenian Church. His account should be compared with the analysis in F. Tournabize, *Histoire politique et religieuse de l'Arménie* (Paris, 1910), 236-239. It should be noted also that Ohnsorge, *Zweikaiserproblem*, 91, continues the interpretation mentioned above, *supra*, n. 37, intimating that Eugene had a hand in cementing the East-West alliance by approving of Manuel's marriage to Bertha. Once again, there is no sufficient reason to represent the Papacy as party to these developments.
40. Gleber, *op.cit.*, 36, Lamma, *op.cit.*, I, 57, n. 1, and, to a lesser degree, Miss Berry in Setton, *op.cit.*, I, 466-467, tend to make the possibility of church union play too important a role in Eugene's decision to summon the crusade.
41. The papal letter has vanished but the imperial reply remains, DR, II, 1348, dated August, 1146, printed in RHF, XV, 440 and in Theiner and Miklosich, *op.cit.*, 6-8. For a general introduction to this letter and its companion piece (*infra*, n. 45), see V. Grumel, "Au seuil de la deuxième croisade: Deux lettres de Manuel Comnène au pape," *Études Byzantines*, III (1945), 143-167.
42. Evidence for this intrigue may be found in Odo of Deuil, *De profectione Ludovici VII in orientem*, ed. and trans., by Virginia G. Berry (New York, 1948), 10. See also Chalandon, *Domination normande*, II, 131-132.
43. Norden, *op.cit.*, 82-83.
44. For a general introduction to the Byzantine attitude towards the crusades, see Charanis, *op.cit.*, (*supra*, n. 1) and the lucid article by P. Lemerle, "Byzance et la croisade," *Relazioni del X. Congresso internazionale di Scienze Storici. III: Storia del Medio Evo* (Firenze, 1955), 595-620.
45. The text of this second imperial letter is in RHF, XV, 974-975. Essential for the understanding of this document is W. Ohnsorge, "Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Manuel I. von Byzanz," *Festschrift Albert Brackmann*, ed., Leo Santifaller (Weimar, 1931), 371-393.
46. There seems to be some uncertainty as to the number of papal legates who participated in the Second Crusade. S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades* (3 vols., Cambridge, 1951-1954), II, 284, n. 1, accepts as *bona-fide* legates only Theodwin and Guy. On the other hand, Berry, in Setton, *op.cit.*, I, 480-481, accepts also Godfrey of Langres and Arnulf of Lisieux. Gleber, *op.cit.*, 59, and Constable *op.cit.*, 263-264 also suggest Bishop Alvis of Arras, making, in Constable's phrase, a "plethora of legates." However, the evidence for Alvis' position as a legate is not of the best, and John of Salisbury seems to deny legate status to Godfrey and Arnulf, XXIV, 54f. Perhaps it is therefore safer to agree with Runciman and accept only Guy and Theodwin as genuine legates of the Papacy. JL, 9095 and William of Tyre, XVII, 1, RHCOe, I, 758-759, would support this decision.
47. JL, 9095, PL, 180, 1251-1252.
48. JL, 9110, PL, 180, 1262.
49. John of Salisbury, XXIV, 55-56, and Miss Berry's judgments on his evidence, in Setton, *op.cit.*, I, 491.
50. As suggested by Norden, *op.cit.*, 83-84, and Constable *op.cit.*, 264.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE WORD OF GOD FOR CALVIN

JOHN T. MCNEILL, *East Middlebury, Vermont*

In the Reformation the phrase "The Word of God" was mighty and prevailed. It was pronounced with assurance and heard with acceptance. To use it was to invoke in one's behalf a divine utterance of incontestible authority, that was documented of old in the canonical scriptures but now freshly revered and understood after long centuries of disregard. The Reformation was, or at any rate aimed to be, a reform of the visible church by applying to it the superior authority of the Word of God, so that the Word may be said to be the panoply of the Reformation, its all-sufficient armor and resource. This appears from Luther's early writings through Calvin's whole work, and that of Protestant writers to a much later era, and is a familiar note in our day.

"The Church is born," wrote Luther in 1520, "through faith in the Word of Promise. For the Word of God is incomparably above the Church."¹ A few years later (January 7, 1526) a Swiss Reformed group confronted their opponents at a disputation with the statement: "The Church was born of the Word of God, abides in it and hears not the voice of strangers." Exactly two years from that date, with the words, "of which Christ is the only Head" inserted after "Church," this sentence headed the Ten Theses presented by the Reformed at the Disputation of Bern.²

"Verbum supra ecclesiam." *"Ecclesia nata est ex Dei verbo."* In these phrases the Reformers affirmed the priority and superiority of the Word of God to the visible Church, and in effect made the Word the reforming censor of all that was claimed and practised in the Church.

It is usually evident in such contexts that "Word of God" is not consciously distinguished from "Holy Scripture." But when our Reformers ask themselves what the phrase signifies to them, we find that they have in mind something more than the words spelled out on the sacred page. Luther in *Christian Liberty*, arguing that "the soul can do without all things except the Word of God" and that the ministers of Christ's Church are called for the ministry of the Word only, adds this:

You may ask, "What then is the Word of God?" . . . I answer, The Apostle explains this in Romans 7. The Word is the gospel of God concerning His Son who was made flesh, suffered, rose . . . was glorified. . .³

The Word thus seems to be closely identified with the clauses referring to Christ in the Apostles' Creed. For Luther Christ is, of course, the

theme of the Scriptures: he is not for a moment dissociating Word from Scripture when he thus puts in creed-like form the opening verses of Romans. The words quoted do not constitute Luther's full definition of "Word of God": but they suggest a quite important aspect of his thought about it.

II.

No expression came more readily to Calvin's pen than "*verbum Dei*"—"la parole de Dieu." The phrase echoes and re-echoes through all his writings. The range of his conception of its meaning is partly suggested by a passage in Book I of the *Institutes*:

Certainly when God's Word is set before us in Scripture it would be the height of absurdity to imagine a merely fleeting and vanishing utterance, which, cast forth into the air, projects itself outside of God. Rather "Word" means the everlasting wisdom, residing in God, from which both all oracles and all prophecies go forth. For as Peter testifies, the ancient prophets spoke by the Spirit of Christ just as much as the Apostles did, and all who thereafter ministered the heavenly doctrine. Indeed, because Christ had not yet been manifested, it is necessary to understand the Word as begotten of the Father before time.⁴

So much is packed into these sentences that they ask for more than the passing attention we can give them here. Calvin is telling us that the "oracles" of Scripture flow from the divine primal wisdom Who is in truth the Word eternally begotten of the Father, and that the Word has had expression not only through prophets and apostles but also through "all who thereafter ministered the heavenly doctrine." This is comprehensive: in other contexts the continuity between apostles and Christian preachers is treated more cautiously.

In a continuation of the same passage, referring to John 1, he states:

God by speaking was the creator of the world. Thereafter inasmuch as all divinely uttered revelations rightly are designated by the title, "Word of God," so that the substantial Word is properly placed on the highest level, the wellspring of all oracles. Subject to no variety the Word abides everlastingly one and the same with God, and is God himself.

Similarly, in his commentary on the opening verses of John's Gospel, Calvin associates the Word of God very intimately with the creation of the world: "No sooner was the world created than the Word of God came forth into external operation."⁵ This basic theological concept pervades his references to the Word: with the thought of the Word of God as the Scripture there is a mental reference to the Word Who was in the beginning, by Whom all things were made, and Who constitutes the matter, the essential theme, of Scripture. This will not surprise us if we recall early and medieval expositions of the passage in John 1. Indeed, Calvin is here following a traditional exegesis,⁶ for a biblical expositor of his time perhaps inescapable, which would make quite inadequate any bald statement that the letter of Scripture is the Word

of God. The Word is rather, to repeat a phrase out of a quotation above, "set before us in Scripture." In Calvin's Geneva Catechism of 1545, a simple manual for the instruction of children, it is stated that God has left us His sacred Word. Then follows the question: "Where must we seek this Word?" The answer is: "In the Holy Scriptures in which it is contained."⁷ There is a distinction between the statement that Scripture is God's Word, and this one, that God's Word is contained in the Scriptures. God's Word and the Bible are not convertible terms in Calvin's thinking, even though in many contexts attention is not called to the distinction.

III.

In his view of Scripture as the bearer of God's Word, Calvin habitually stresses the role of the Holy Spirit. The Word of God that is revealed in the Scripture is recognized only by those to whom it is interpreted by the Holy Spirit. Our persuasion that the Scripture comes from God does not rest upon reason. It is to be sought only from the secret testimony of the Spirit—"ab arcano testimonio spiritus." It is idle to try to convince the incredulous of this by disputation. The same Spirit who spake by the mouths of the prophets must penetrate our hearts. This inner witness of the Spirit is superior to reason. Those who are inwardly taught ("*quos spiritus sanctus intus docuit*") fully acquiesce in the Scripture, and regard it as self-authenticating (*autopistos*). Reasons, indeed, can be supplied, but they do not produce faith, and they are superfluous where the Spirit illuminates and persuades. Scripture will produce a saving knowledge of God only where the certainty of it has been established on the inner persuasion of the Holy Spirit. Human testimonies may contribute something, but only as secondary aids to our incapacity—"velut secundaria nostræ imbecillitatis adminicula."⁸

Occasionally this language may be so varied as to retain the reference to Christ. Thus, noting that the Spirit calls to remembrance what has been verbally taught, he interprets 2 Cor. 3:6 ("the written code kills but the spirit gives life") to mean that Christ the inward master ("*Christus ipse interior magister*") by His Spirit draws the elect to Himself. We are not here discussing Calvin's doctrine of the Trinity, but one may ask whether in such references the thought ever came to his mind that has been expressed by Henry Pitney Van Dusen, who remarks that the natural affinity of the Logos idea was with the Old Testament thought of the Spirit, and asks:

What would have been the consequences for Christian theology if the Logos had been identified with the Third rather than the Second Person in the Christian triune conception of God, with the Spirit rather than with Christ?⁹

So far as I am aware, this thought finds no expression in Calvin's

work. But just as he identifies the Son who is the Logos with the Word, so he insistently associates Word and Spirit, and views with alarm any tendency to assert the authority of the Spirit in personal utterances away from the Word not less than any reading of the Word of Scripture without the guidance of the Spirit. This necessary conjunction of Word and Spirit is the theme of one short, vivid chapter of the Institutes¹⁰ where the Spirit is designated "Spirit of God" or "Spirit of Christ," and is spoken of as "the Author of the Scriptures." Here we read that "the letter itself is dead,"

But if it is effectively impressed on the heart by the Spirit, if it exhibits Christ, it is the Word of Life, converting the soul . . .

and again:

For the Lord has coupled together in a kind of mutual connection the certainty of His Word and His Spirit.¹¹

So then, the inward and secret witness of His Spirit is a witness to Christ, and the Scriptures speak their message to us when they show forth Christ. This is very close to the more colorful language of Luther in the oft-quoted sentence from his Preface to the Epistles of James and Jude, where he says:

And herein all genuine holy books agree, that they all together preach and urge Christ (*Christum predigen und treiben*). Moreover the true touchstone for judging (*tadeln*, censuring) is, as we see, whether they urge Christ (*Christum treiben*) or not. What does not teach Christ is not apostolic, even if St. Peter or St. Paul teach it. Again, what preaches Christ would be apostolic even if Judas, Annas, Pilate or Herod were to do it.¹²

IV.

With Christ as the theme of the Scripture, two things are bound to happen. In the first place, every passage that can be associated with Christ, whether in the Old Testament or the New, will be closely examined and interpreted in that light. For Calvin, this does not allow the interpreter to give the rein to allegory and reckless speculation. He repeatedly declares against such methods and insists on what he calls "the natural and obvious meaning."¹³ But it is in anticipating the revelation of Christ in the Gospels that the Old Testament is significant for us. In the second place, the same principle of interpretation will silently exclude from *functioning* as divine Scripture a good many passages of the Bible. Calvin of course declares for the received canonical books, but like every other discerning reader he has favorites among them. He omitted from his task as a commentator nine books of the Old Testament and one of the New Testament, the Book of Revelation. In the case of Revelation it was said by the political writer Bodin, who had been in Geneva, that he confessed his inability to understand its meaning. His use of proof-texts has a wide range, but Joshua, Judges, Chronicles, Esther and the Song of Songs are referred to very scantily, and hardly more frequently than the Old Testament Apocrypha. The

Psalms, Isaiah, Matthew, John, Acts, Romans, the other letters of Paul, I Peter and I John, have by comparison with their length disproportionately frequent use. So, while he broadly takes the canonical Scriptures as containing the divine revelation, practically, like all preachers, he has a canon within the canon.

Calvin's use of the Old Testament is extensive, but selective. By Prof. Clavier's count of the references, he uses in the *Institutes* 3098 New Testament references and only 1755 references to the Old Testament. These numbers must be increased: in a tabulation as yet unpublished, Dr. Ford Battles has listed passages of the New Testament numbering 3998, and of the Old 2351 (plus 12 references to the Apocrypha). The proportion remains about the same however, and it is uncomfortable to those who would lead us to believe that Calvin's theology is Old Testament theology. There are roughly as many references to Acts and Paul as to the entire Old Testament. It is not to be questioned, of course, that he defended the validity of Old Testament revelation. In a passage quoted at the outset of this paper, "the ancient prophets spoke by the Spirit of Christ." But he also goes to some pains to show what he calls "the superior excellence of the New Testament over the Old."¹⁴ Not that on right interpretation there is disagreement between them, but that God's revelation is far more clearly expressed and more amply shed abroad among men in the New Testament. The ancient covenant of grace is not repealed but fulfilled: Christ calls his followers to feast in the Kingdom with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.¹⁵ The task committed to Moses and all the prophets was "to teach the way of reconciliation" between God and men (whence Paul also calls Christ "the end of the law," Rom. 10:4).¹⁶ But attention is insistently called to "the distinction between the clarity of the Gospel and the obscurer dispensation of the Word which preceded it"; and, he quotes, "the Law and the prophets were until John" (Luke 16:16). In this connection,¹⁷ Calvin discusses five ways in which the New Testament marks an advance upon the Old. I note only the last of these.

This fifth difference, often referred to elsewhere, lies in the fact that until the coming of Christ the covenant of grace was confined to one nation. Israel was then the Lord's darling son; the others were strangers. . . . The calling of the Gentiles is a notable work, showing the excellence of the New Testament over the Old. He goes on to call it a departure so new and strange that the Apostles were astonished, and Paul called it a mystery hidden for ages (Col. 1:26).¹⁸ No fault should be found with the fact that God treated the ancient Jews as children, and treats Christians as grown men.

Thus the change from the Old Testament to the New is real and profound. Yet it is a development, like adjusting instruction to a grow-

ing child, rather than revolutionary. It is not a reversal but a fulfilment.

The fact needs to be recognized that Calvin was one of the first writers to view the history of the Bible as a development. Indeed he states this with great frankness. He sees the books of the Old Testament as presenting the divine revelation in a progressive sequence. Paul T. Fuhrmann has truly said:

Calvin holds revelation to have been progressive through the ages. He attributes its progress, however, not to the evolution of man's religiousness but to God's increasing dispensation of ever clearer light.¹⁰

In the books of Moses the patriarchs learn the higher lessons that come from affliction and the denial of hoped-for prosperity. In the Psalms there appears some element of the hope of future blessedness, and Job has intimations of immortality. In the later prophets we are on firmer ground, in finding proof of belief in the life to come. Calvin sums up:

The Lord kept this plan and order in administering the covenant of his mercy: as the day of full revelation approached with the passing of time, the more He increased each day the brightness of its manifestation. Accordingly at the beginning, when the first promise of salvation was given to Adam, it glowed like a feeble spark. Then as it was added to, the light grew in fulness, breaking forth increasingly and shedding its radiance more widely. At last when all the clouds were dispersed, Christ the Sun of righteousness fully illumined the whole world.

The prophets, indeed, represented the goodness of God under the figure of temporal benefits. But they painted a likeness so striking as to lift the minds of the people above the earth, leading them to ponder the happiness of the spiritual life to come. Examples are taken from Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones, and from Isaiah 66 and Daniel.²⁰

In a remarkable passage in his Commentary on Isaiah Calvin stresses the assurance Christians possess of the truth of revelation. In Christ God has removed all doubt. The Christian may say what Christ said to the Samaritan woman, "We worship what we know."

It is proper to observe the contrast between the dark and feeble kind of knowledge which the fathers enjoyed under the law, and that fulness which shines forth to us in the Gospel. Though God deigned to bestow on his ancient people the light of heavenly doctrine, yet he made himself more familiarly known through Christ.²¹

We obtain manumission from the Law, says Calvin, "when by faith we apprehend the mercy of God in Christ." "For this reason the promises offered in the Law would be ineffectual did not God in His goodness send the Gospel to our aid."²²

While rejecting wayward allegorizations, Calvin frequently makes use of typology. The sacrifices of the Old Testament are a type of Christ's sacrifice by which they have been superseded; the land of Canaan is a type of heavenly bliss. The Christian sacraments had their ancient counterparts: they were anticipated in Noah's rainbow, Gideon's fleece, and the rite of circumcision. Many of the incidents of the Old

Testament history have in them elements that are valuable as foreshadowing New Testament realities. By types and foreshadowings and their fulfilments, revelation has developed. Where in the Scriptures God is represented as having mouth, eyes, ears, and hands, or nostrils pleased with incense, He is said to "lisp" (*balbutire*) for us as nurses do when they speak to little tots.²³

Thus the story of the Bible is the story of man's religious education, revelation having been adjusted to the stages of progress from man's infancy to his maturity. Calvin would, of course, have been incensed if it had been suggested that something more mature than the Christian revelation as given in the New Testament might still be in store for man in the providence of God.²⁴ Yet he was skirting a realm of ideas as dangerous to his own orthodoxy as was Newman in his *Development of Doctrine*, a book from which Roman Catholic Modernists (condemned in 1907) claimed to find encouragement. Various accommodation theories of inspiration, including Lessing's *Education of the Human Race*, might find support in Calvin's notions of the infancy of ancient Judaism and the progressive expression of the truth of God in the Bible.

The idea of an accommodation to the mental status of man in a primitive state enables him to escape embarrassment in facing the challenge of astronomical science. On Gen. 1:16, "the lesser light to rule the night," he boldly adjusts matters between Moses and the astronomers. Is the moon second in size to the sun among the heavenly bodies, as the text presupposes? Certainly not. Astronomers have conclusively proved that the star of Saturn is larger than the moon. Calvin has no wish here to use Genesis to deny the findings of science. He will not permit the two to clash:

Moses wrote in a popular style things which, without instruction, all ordinary persons, endued with common sense, are able to understand; but astronomers investigate with great labor whatever the sagacity of the human mind can comprehend. Nevertheless this study is not to be reprobated, nor this science to be condemned. . . . For astronomy is not only pleasant, but very useful to be known; it cannot be denied that this art unfolds the admirable wisdom of God. Astronomers are to be honored, and persons who have leisure and capacity ought not to neglect this study. Nor did Moses truly wish to withdraw us from this pursuit . . . ; but because he was ordained a teacher as well of the unlearned and rude as of the learned, he could not otherwise fulfil his office than by descending to this grosser method of instruction. . . . The astronomer finds the moon less than Saturn, but this is something abstruse, for it appears larger. Moses therefore rather adapts his discourse to common usage. . . . Let the astronomers possess their more exalted knowledge; but in the meantime they who perceive by the moon the splendor of night are convicted of perverse ingratitude unless they acknowledge the beneficence of God.²⁵

Thus, characteristically referring all the world's ravishing beauty at once to God, Calvin defends Moses for suppressing astronomical refinements in the interests of popular appreciation of the work of God. He implies that Moses knew the facts, but since his purpose was not scientific but religious, chose not to impart them. There is a very similar passage in Thomas Aquinas, and Calvin may have had it in mind.²⁶ But it is questionable whether he would have treated a similarly unscientific statement with this casual freedom, if he had found one in the New Testament.

V.

The whole work of Calvin is predicated on the truth of Scripture and the authority of Scripture for every Christian. It is assumed to be the constant guide and, so to speak, the *vade mecum* not only of the Christian minister but of the Christian man or woman in any station. God is revealed in the majesty and beauty of creation: man, corrupted by the primal sin, is by nature incapable of receiving this revelation. At best we are like old people who can scarcely read two consecutive words even of the most beautiful book until they are provided with spectacles, whereupon they read distinctly. The Scripture fulfils this function, and so plays an indispensable role in dispelling our spiritual darkness.²⁷ The inference of much that Calvin says is that no one is a Christian who is not instructed in and familiar with the Word of God as it is revealed in the Bible, who does not habitually seek its guidance with the aid of the Holy Spirit.

For the minister, especially, the Word of God is, moreover, a source of irresistible authority and power. In a section on the power of pastors in his *Instruction in Faith* he speaks of the power of binding and loosing in Matt. 16:19, and adds:

But let us remember that this power (which in the Scripture is attributed to pastors) is wholly contained in and limited to the ministry of the word. For Christ has not given this power properly to these men, but to his word of which he has made these men ministers. Hence, let pastors boldly dare all things by the word of God, of which they have been constituted dispensators; let them constrain all the power, glory and haughtiness of the world to make room for and to obey the majesty of that word; let them by means of that word command all from the greatest to the smallest; let them edify the house of Christ; let them demolish the reign of Satan . . . but all through and within the word of God. Pastors who substitute their own fancies for the word are to be chased away as wolves. For Christ has commanded us to listen only to those who teach us that which they have taken from his word.²⁸

In the preaching and teaching of Scripture rested Calvin's vivid hope for the unity of Christ's Church as well as its revival. In his Commentary on Micah, having warned against any worship that is not based on the Word, he continues:

And hence we learn that there is no other way of raising up the Church of God than by the light of the Word, in which God himself by his own voice points out the way of salvation. Until that truth shines men cannot be united together so as to form a true Church.²⁹

It may be replied that elsewhere Calvin writes eloquently of the only possible unity of the Church as being that which it has in Christ.³⁰ In his commentaries he is apt to exploit every passage and does not always bring into harmony his own statements made fragmentarily. Yet for him there is no real inconsistency in saying that the unity of the Church is in Christ alone when he is expounding Ephesians and that it is the Word of God alone when he is lecturing on Micah. As we saw, Christ is the Word in person, and the Scripture expresses the Word in written form.

Very frequently we find Calvin thinking of the Reformation of the Church in which he participates as the historic victory of the Word of God. Illustrations of this abound in his tracts and commentaries. On the verse "I will cut off the idols out of the land" (Zech. 13:2) he pictures the Church restored and freed from the delusions of Satan through God's Word:

As by the rising of the sun darkness is put to flight and all things appear distinctly to view, so also when God comes forth with the teaching of His word all the deceptions of Satan must necessarily be dissipated.

VI.

We cannot enter further upon the consideration of the Word as God's own instrument of power, a power to hew and hammer down evil, to search our hearts and enlighten our minds, a power from which no human rank or dignity is exempt.³¹ With typical predecessors, Calvin holds what Aquinas affirms in the words, "God is the Author of Scripture." But on the manner of the inspiration of Scripture, he is fragmentary and unsystematic. Certain strong phrases affirming the reliability of Scripture have been held as evidence of a belief in verbal inerrancy. On the other hand in the Commentaries he habitually treats the Bible texts as historical products of situations in which the writers moved and made personal response to the divine impact upon their lives. He habitually keeps in view the human writer of each book, his purpose and intent in each passage; he often features what experts in our time have called the *Sitz im Leben*; and he manifestly feels that such matters are important if the full meaning and message of Scripture are to be conveyed.

This approval stands in contrast with the view set forth by Gregory the Great. In his *Moralia*, his celebrated lectures on Job, Gregory dismisses the question of the authorship of that Book, "since it was not the work of man but of the Holy Spirit." We do not ask of a great author's work with what pen he wrote it.

Thus when we understand the matter, and hold that the Holy Spirit was its author, in seeking out the writer what else are we doing than, in reading a letter, to inquire about the pen?³²

To Calvin the writer is always far more than a pen; he is a man to whose soul God has revealed Himself, and it is not only legitimate but highly profitable to the reader to become acquainted with him. One of the passages in which he sheds some light on his view of the inspiration of Scripture is the following:

But whether God became known to the Patriarchs through Oracles and visions, or put into their minds through the work and ministry of men what they should hand down to posterity, at any rate there is no doubt that firm certainty of doctrine was engraven on their hearts, so that they were convinced and understood that what they had learned proceeded from God. For God by his Word ever rendered unambiguous the faith which should be superior to all opinion.

These oracles given to the patriarchs he willed to be recorded. With this intent the Law has been published, to which afterwards the prophets were added as its interpreters.³³

Without expanding on this passage in Calvin, we may say at once that it clearly implies a view of the origin and inspiration of Scripture in which the writers are not automatons. God has put the message into their minds. In accord with this (to take one of innumerable examples) Calvin begins his commentary on Philemon with the words: "The singular loftiness of the mind of Paul . . . is also attested by this epistle."

Such a point of view does not harmonize with a doctrine of the verbal inerrancy of Scripture,—a doctrine which has been zealously embraced by some Calvinists with alleged support from Calvin. Let us consider the citations from Calvin that are commonly employed in this argument. A passage very often quoted is *Institutes* IV, viii, 9 where he calls the Apostolic writers "sure and authentic amanuenses of the Holy Spirit" (*certi et authentici amanuenses . . .*). This strong passage occurs in a paragraph that begins with a citation of I Pet. 4:11 where Christians are enjoined, if they speak in meetings, to speak as those who "utter the oracles of God." Calvin says they are to speak with the confidence of those who are furnished with a commission from God. Pastors of the church ought to be invested with this power from God to exercise their office by the Word of God,—and in that Word to exhort, rebuke, restrain, bind and loose, discharge their lightnings and thunders. But he differentiates the apostles from their successors in that the apostolic writings are to be received as oracles of God, since they are written by the *certi et authentici amanuenses* of the Holy Spirit. Succeeding ministers have only to teach what is revealed in the Scriptures, not to frame any new doctrine but to adhere to the doctrine which God has appointed.

Now it is true that the word *amanuenses* suggests a recording secretary, and though in our experience amanuenses are not inerrant, here they are reliable (*certi*) and authentic. In French the expression used is "*comme notaires jurez*," as sworn notaries, or court reporters. Nevertheless the context speaks explicitly of doctrine and not of words, and it seems to me that to interpret this as an assertion of inerrant verbal inspiration or dictation is to press Calvin's meaning too far.

There is a similar passage in *Institutes* IV, viii, 6. Dr. Edward A. Dowey has called this "the most extreme" of Calvin's expressions of "the divine origin and complete validity of Scripture,"³⁴ and it is certainly intended to convey that judgment; but I am far from being convinced that Calvin had in mind also the divine perfection of the very words of Scripture. Here he uses the phrase "*dictante spiritu sancto*"—the Holy Spirit dictating. Let us give the sentence in full. Having referred to the Old Testament prophecies, he continues: "To these were added at the same time histories which are the compositions ("*lucubrationes*") of the prophets but framed ("*compositae*") at the dictation of the Holy Spirit." It is true that the last phrase in some appropriate context might be taken as supporting a view of literal or verbal inspiration. But the writings are "*lucubrationes*" of the prophets who wrote them. Calvin, the classical scholar, knew well that lucubrations are literally compositions by lamp or candle light. He seems to be telling us that the Scripture writers burned the midnight oil, composing at the dictation of the Holy Spirit. He notes that the Law, Prophets and Psalms taken together constituted the Word of the Lord for the people of old and the standard by which priests and teachers were to weigh their own teachings ("*suam doctrinam exigere debuerunt*"), turning neither to the right nor to the left, so that they might speak "from the mouth of God." The concern of the passage is evidently with sound doctrine; I fail to see that it shows an interest in the verbal expression of this.

How does he treat the familiar text, "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable" (2 Tim. 3:16)? Calvin tells us that the Apostle declares the Scripture to have authority and utility, and that "in order to uphold the authority of Scripture he declares it to be divinely inspired. . . . The prophets, they [the apostolic writers] believed, did not speak at their own suggestion but being organs of the Holy Spirit they uttered only what they were commissioned to declare. It is requisite, then, to recognize that the law and the gospel are not a doctrine delivered according to the will and pleasure of men but dictated by the Holy Spirit." The statement is "a doctrine . . . dictated." It is not said that the Scripture is verbally dictated; the point is simply that its teaching (*doctrina*) is not of men but of God.³⁵ And when he

adds that we should hold it in that reverence that we owe to God since it has proceeded from Him alone and has nothing belonging to man mingled with it, it is still the doctrine, the content and spiritual message, rather than the mere words of which he is speaking.

Calvin, like the rest of us, is familiar with a use of the word "dictate" in a context in which it has reference to ideas, not to the form of words in which they are expressed. Thus he enjoins us "to put off our own nature and to deny whatever our reason and will dictate."³⁶ Again it is at the dictation of experience ("*experientia dictante*") that pagan poets speak of God as father of men.³⁷ And the natural law written on all hearts dictates ("*dictat lex illa interior*") what is to be learned from the two tables of the Commandments.³⁸

Another of the emphatic statements, though rarely cited,³⁹ is in the Commentary on John 12:13, the Hosannah greeting to Christ from Ps. 118:25. Here Calvin says that the spirit put the words in the mouths of the throng. But again the context wholly fails to support a doctrine of literal or verbal inspiration. For he has just explained at some length that the phrase of the psalm was already in general use ("*passim tritam*") among the Jews, and was in everybody's mouth ("*in oram omnium versatam*"). What the Spirit did, then, was to prompt an utterance of words familiar from frequent use. We may compare with this the commentary on Jeremiah 36:4-6 cited by Dr. Dowey,⁴⁰ where the Scripture text repeatedly refers to "words" (*divrē*). It is worth mentioning that for the Vulgate "*verba*" Calvin here substitutes "*sermones*," as if to refer not so much to individual words as to the detached utterances which the prophet is commanded to write out in a book. The book, he observes, contains "the sum of the whole doctrine (*summam totius doctrinam*)" previously taught in separate utterances by Jeremiah. When the book was destroyed, again at God's command, the prophet "dictated" its contents, and "no doubt God suggested (*suggererit*) what could otherwise have been erased from the prophet's memory." Thus Baruch wrote down "the whole sum of the prophetic doctrine (*totam doctrinæ summam*)". Calvin says here, indeed, that many "*sermones*" would have been omitted if God had not "dictated" them again to the prophet, guiding his mind and tongue, and that he "recited what God commanded (*jubebat*)". There is in the passage only one use of the verb "dictate" as a divine act upon the prophet's mind. This account of a miraculous reproduction of an earlier reproduction of what were originally disconnected fragments of spoken prophecy, in course of a comment that is notably concerned with "doctrine," seems to me fragile evidence on which to rest the assertion of divine verbal inerrancy in Calvin. If he had intended to argue for in-

errancy here, would he not have felt obliged to carry the argument over to the scribe and the scroll?

Let us take one more reference by Calvin to apostolic writers, where there is a specific reference to words (*verba*). In his Commentary on Romans he says on Rom. 3:4 that the Apostles took liberties in quoting the Old Testament. Paul has followed the LXX which has erroneously employed a passive voice (*krinesthai*) in translating Ps. 51:4, "that thou mightst be justified". Pointing out the inaccuracy, he does not explain it away, but goes on to generalize thus:

1) For we know that in repeating the words of Scripture the apostles were often pretty free (*in recitandis scripturae verbis saepe esse liberiores*) since they held it sufficient if they cited them in accordance with the matter (*ad rem*); for this reason they did not make the words a point of conscience (*quare non tantum illis fuit verborum religio*).

Now Calvin is not one to minimize accuracy in the quotation of Scripture and he is obviously a little disconcerted by St. Paul's choice of a defective rendering. But his frank acknowledgement that the apostolic writers were concerned with matter, not words, and that theirs was not a *religio verborum*, is quite characteristic. It is the doctrine—the matter—that is divine. The words, in such instances at least, are the words of the men who wrote them. Correspondingly he says on Ps. 119:116, "We are said to fall away from God's Word when we fall from the faith of it." It is very evident, too, that he views with displeasure, and even scorn, the effort to establish a doctrine by laying undue stress upon individual words. He adopts, as we saw, "the natural meaning," and this is not always the literal meaning alone. Figures of speech must be recognized where they occur. Thus he charges his opponents on the Lord's Supper with being bound by a "*verborum religio*" in their view of the sentence "*Hoc est corpus meum*." They are also perverse "exactors of the letter (*literæ exactores*)", and "trappers of syllables (*syllaborum aucupes*)".

Other instances of this kind abound. In Acts 7:16 Luke has "made a manifest error" as shown by the text of Gen. 23:9. The reader is to bear in mind that the statement should be corrected: "*Hic locus corrigendus est*." On Heb. 2:7 Calvin notes that the phrase in Ps. 8 "a little lower than the angels" is there rendered "for a little while . . .", and thus "*in diversum sensum*"—away from the meaning of the Psalmist. In Heb. 10:5 he is (like modern commentators) perplexed at the widely variant quotation from Ps. 40:6 and is led to say: "For in quoting words the apostles were not so meticulous (*neque enim in verbis recitandis adeo religiosi fuerunt*) provided only that they do not falsely pervert scripture to their own convenience . . . but with respect both to words and to other things which do not bear upon the matters

in discussion, they allow themselves wide freedom (*sibi liberius indulgent*).⁴² Again Calvin finds in Eph. 4:8 that Paul "to serve the purpose of his argument has departed not a little from the true meaning" of the passage in Ps. 68:18 to which he refers, even seeming to invert the psalmist's phrase, "received gifts from men."

Calvin also states that the Scripture came "by the ministry of men from the very mouth of God (*hominum ministerio ipsissimo Dei ore*)".⁴³ He not infrequently describes a passage of Scripture as "from the mouth of God." It is possible to give this expression a more absolute interpretation than he intended it to bear. He does not shrink from using it with reference to non-scriptural utterances. In his Homily 42 on I Sam. he stresses the authority of prophets and pastors in the Christian Church, declaring that they are "the very mouth of God."⁴⁴ And in his Commentary on John 3:2 he declares that we are not to listen to any persons except those by whose mouth God speaks.

VII.

Calvin would no doubt have argued for the verbal accuracy of Scripture if as a scholar he could have done so consistently. He does not set himself to prove the contrary; rather he is obliged from time to time to admit that defects have to be recognized. This he does many times and quite frankly. He offers us, to be sure, no systematic treatment of the relation of the infallible Word to the fallible letter. This has been attempted in later times under the pressure of evidence from textual and historical criticism. Defenders of inerrancy have in the end been driven to apply the term to an alleged original text of Scripture no longer extant or available. Calvin does not get himself into such a trap. He admits, unwillingly no doubt, that the original text in certain instances was not flawless. We have seen examples of this where New Testament writers made verbally erroneous renderings of Old Testament phrases. But the instances are by no means confined to such passages.

To illustrate: on the origin of II Peter, Calvin takes the view that the matter is praiseworthy, the teaching shows throughout an apostolic spirit, but the style is defective; and he conjectures that the aged apostle may have left the epistle to be put into writing by one of his disciples. "I do not," he observed, "recognize the language of Peter."⁴⁵ Again on Acts 4:6 he definitely prefers Josephus to Luke on the chronology of the high priests in Jerusalem: "*mirum est*," he remarks, "It is strange that Luke here makes Annas the high priest," since it appears otherwise from Josephus. In the earliest of his Commentaries, that of Romans, he acknowledges a defect of style in the difficult verse Rom. 5:15. G. H. C. MacGregor in the *Interpreter's Bible* describes this verse as "awkwardly constructed and marked by

no little repetition and confusion." Calvin refers also to its repetitions, lack of connection, and ellipses, and adds:

Such instances are indeed defects in a discourse; but they are not prejudicial to the majesty of that celestial wisdom which is taught us by the Apostle; it has, on the contrary, so happened through the providence of God, that the highest mysteries have been delivered to us in the garb of a humble style, in order that our faith may not depend on the potency of human eloquence, but on the efficacious working of the spirit alone.

So the Commentary is translated by John Owen. But the phrase rendered "in the garb of a humble style" is stronger in the original. Literally it is "under a contemptible lowliness of words." Calvin plainly felt that here St. Paul simply wrote very badly, though he wrote of the highest mysteries. Some think, he tells us, "that the Apostle carries on here a chain of reasoning," but he adds that "not all will find this evident."⁴⁵ This is characteristic. Calvin admits "defects in the discourse" but therewith affirms "the majesty of that celestial wisdom" in which the Word consists.

We may conclude by recapitulating some points treated in this paper.

1. For Calvin the Scripture brings the Word of God to those only who are inwardly taught and persuaded by the Holy Spirit, and Word and Spirit must never be dissociated as if one of these could serve for man's salvation without the other.
2. Calvin stresses, as few have done, the authority and indispensability of the Scripture for the Church and its ministers and for all Christians.
3. He regards the Old Testament as significant for its adumbrations and anticipations of the clearer revelation of the New, and sees the Bible as showing a progressive revelation from the "feeble spark" shown to Adam to the far-shed radiance of the Gospel. For him, as for Luther, the significance of the Bible turns upon the Gospel of reconciliation in Christ.
4. He finds himself obliged to recognize some errors and defects in the words of Scripture, opposes those who overwork individual words in theological argument, and refuses to allow textual defects to mar the power and majesty of the message.

1. "*Supra ecclesiam.*" Luther, *Babylonian Captivity of the Church*, section on Ordination: *Werke*, W. A. VI, 560; *Works of Martin Luther*, Philadelphia edition II, 273.

2. Disputation of Ilanz, Theses presented by Comander, Jan. 7, 1526; and the

Ten Theses of Bern, prepared by Berthold Haller, Franz Kolb and Huldreich Zwingli and presented Jan. 7, 1528.

3. *On Christian Liberty. Werke*, W. A. VII, 54; *Luther's Works*, American Edition, XXI, 346.

4. *Institutes* I, xiii, 7.

5. Commentary on John 1:3.
6. The prevailing application of *Verbum Dei* in the Church Fathers is to the second Person of the Trinity as in John 1. The use of the expression for Holy Scripture is easily traceable, however. See Melancthon, *De ecclesia et de auctoritate verbi Dei* (1539) in R. Stupperich, *Melancthon's Werke in Auswahl I* (Gütersloh, 1951), 238; A. Harnack, *History of Dogma*, tr. J. Millar, V (London, 1898), 155f. Cf. Bede the Venerable, *Eccelesiastical History of the English People*, III, v: "enutriti verbo Dei"—nourished on God's word. Loeb Classical Library, *Bede I*, 408. Wyclif's use of the expression in this sense is habitual. Frequently a double reference, to Christ and Scripture, appears to be implied. This is probably the case where Augustine describes a sacrament as "visibile verbum": *Discourses on John's Gospel* lxxx, 3: "Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum, etiam ipsum tamquam visibile verbum." *MPL* 35, 1840. (with reference to Rom. 10:10).
7. "In scripturis sanctis, quibus continentur." Geneva Catechism, 1545, *Corpus Reformatorum, Calvin*, VI, 110; tr. J. K. S. Reid, Library of Christian Classics XXII (Philadelphia, 1954), p. 130.
8. *Institutes I*, vii, 4, 5; I, viii, 13.
9. H. P. Van Dusen, *Spirit, Son and Father*. (New York, 1958), p. 49.
10. *Institutes I*, ix.
11. *Ibid.*, sections 3, 4.
12. Luther, *Werke*, ed. Walch, XIV, 149. For an alternate translation see B. L. Woolf, *Reformation Writings of Martin Luther* (London 1956), p. 307.
13. Commentary on Gal. 4:22-26. Cf. his letter to Lelio Socino (1552): "I have always had a horror of paradoxes and tricks of argument (*argutiae*) do not please me at all. But nothing will ever prevent me from simply professing that which I have learned from the Word of God." (*C. R.* XIV, 330). The words "I abhor paradoxes" occur also in his tract, "The Council of Trent with the Antidote" (*Corpus Reformatorum, Calvin*, VII, 474; tr. Beveridge, *Tracts III*, 149).
14. *Institutes II*, xi, 12.
15. *II*, x, 23.
16. *I*, vi, 2.
17. *II*, xi, 1-12.
18. *Institutes II*, xi, 11-12.
19. P. T. Fuhrmann, "Calvin the Expositor of Scripture," *Interpretation VI* (1952), 193.
20. *Institutes II*, x, 20-22.
21. Commentary on Isaiah, Is. 25:9. See also Commentary on II Cor. 3:14, 16, 17; and Commentary on I Peter, 1:10, 11.
22. *Institutes III*, xvii, 1-2.
23. *Institutes I*, xiii, 1. Cf. *I*, xvii, 12, 13.
24. Cf. *Institutes IV*, viii, 7 and Commentary on I Pet. 1:25 ("revelationis fines").
25. Commentary on Gen. 1:16.
26. Aquinas, *Summa Theologica I*, qu. lxxviii, art. 3.
27. *Institutes I*, vi, 1.
28. *Calvini Opera Selecta*. ed. P. Barth and W. Niesel, I (Munich, 1926), 414 f; tr. P. T. Fuhrmann, Calvin, *Instruction in Faith* (Philadelphia, 1949), p. 73.
29. Commentary on Micah 4:1.
30. *E.g.* Commentary on Eph. 1:10.
31. See for example, Commentary on Hos. 5:2; Amos 6:13; Haggai 1:13.
32. Gregory the Great, *Moralia (Praefatio)*, Migne, *P.L.* 75, 517.
33. *Institutes I*, vi, 2.
34. E. A. Dowey, *The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology* (New York, 1952), p. 91.
35. Cf. Doumergue's remark on another passage: "Ce que le Saint Esprit a dicté, c'est une doctrine." (E. Doumergue, *Jean Calvin*, IV, 78,) and J. K. S. Reid, *The Authority of Scripture* (London, 1957), p. 44. On p. 54 Dr. Reid has a list of titles on Calvin's view of inspiration. I am not supplying a bibliography here, but most of the works that have provided materials for this paper (apart from Calvin's own which have been chiefly used) are there mentioned by Reid.
36. *Institutes III*, vii, 3. Cf. *III*, xxv, 7: "hoc dictat aperta ratio."
37. *Institutes I*, v, 3.
38. *Institutes II*, xvii, 1.
39. L. Goumaz, *La doctrine du salut d'après les commentaires de Jean Calvin sur le Nouveau Testament* (Paris, 1917), p. 112.
40. Dowey, *op. cit.*, pp. 92f.
41. *Institutes IV*, xvii, 20.
42. *Institutes I*, vii, 5.
43. *Corpus Reformatorum, Calvin XXXIX*, 705.
44. Commentary on II Peter, "Argument."
45. Commentary on Rom. 5:15.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS TO THE INDIANS OF OREGON

THOMAS E. JESSETT, *The Highlands Parish (P. E.), Seattle*

Historians who have been concerned with Christian missions to the Indians of Oregon have generally limited their writings to denominational histories or to biographies glorifying the missionaries. Little has been done to correlate the efforts of the various individuals and denominations involved, in the light of the economic and political situation, so necessary for the presentation of a complete picture of the total missionary enterprise in the proper perspective. In this brief paper an attempt will be made to do just this.

The Christian missions to the Indians of Oregon in the first half of the nineteenth century were but a small part of a great world-wide expansion of the white man's culture during that period. This sweep of the western white civilization around the world was a two-pronged affair. On the one hand it was spear-headed by the missionary who sought to bring to the native peoples the good news of the Christian Gospel with its emphasis upon the brotherhood of man, and of the justice and mercy of Almighty God. On the other hand were the traders and settlers who sought to exploit the economic resources of distant places, and wherever possible, to occupy the land for their own use. This dichotomy between the missionary and the settler often led to conflict between the two, but more often, and especially in Oregon, it was so much a part of the intruding white man that he was unaware of it, even when he was a Christian missionary.

Quite naturally, this dichotomy, which is a characteristic of post-Reformation civilizations, created many tensions among the peoples who felt its impact. Because of the rapidity with which these tensions developed in Oregon, this world-wide conflict can be viewed here in miniature. The story of the Christian missions to the Indians of Oregon is one which shows a pattern that has been repeated, and is still being repeated, wherever the culture of western civilization and primitive native cultures come into contact.

The drama of this clash of cultures began in the closing years of the eighteenth and the opening years of the nineteenth centuries in the Oregon country. Of the Spanish settlement at Nootka Sound on Vancouver Island in the last decade of the eighteenth century little need be said. It was strictly a military occupation and, while priests of the Roman Catholic Church accompanied the expedition, little was done in the way of missionary work among the Indians. Some converts were made, but when the Spaniards departed in 1795 they took them with them. Two sailors who were captives of these Indians for a two year

period less than a decade later were unable to find any signs of Christianity among these Indians!¹

The British and American fur traders who came to the Oregon Country cared only for the fantastic profits to be made from trading with the Indians. They sought merely to exploit, not to colonize. Their impact had two effects upon the natives. It raised their standard of living by the introduction of new tools and materials, and it caused them to question the effectiveness of their own religion and to develop an interest in the white man's religion. For to the Indian, religion meant power; and the obviously superior level of the white man's culture meant that his gods must be greater.

Thus it was that the Indians on the coast sent inquiries via sea captains to the missionaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (Congregationalist and Presbyterian) in the Hawaiian Islands asking for a teacher. To investigate this appeal the American Board sent the Reverend Jonathan S. Green of the Hawaiian Mission to explore the northwest coast in 1829. Green visited the Russian settlement in Alaska and sailed down the coast. Although he was unable to enter the Columbia river he was much impressed by the country and recommended the establishment of a mission at its mouth. In its plan for a mission to the Indians the American Board visualized another sort of "Plymouth colony"² in which the idea of a missionary enterprise was mixed with that of colonization. The penetration of Oregon as they viewed it was a two-pronged affair: Christianizing the Indians and settling the country with whites. Nothing came of this immediately, however.

The desire of the Indians of Oregon for a knowledge of Christianity was evident in 1825 when Governor George Simpson of the Hudson's Bay Company visited the region. Simpson started services at Fort George according to the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England on Sundays, a practice which was continued when the headquarters were moved to Fort Vancouver. No doubt Indians watching these services were influenced somewhat by them; but their great interest was shown when Simpson asked Alexander Ross at Spokane House to procure two lads to go back with him to Fort Garry on the Red River (now Winnipeg, Canada) for an education at the Church of England Mission there. The Church Missionary Society which supported this work had requested Simpson to bring back young Indians from different tribes to the school. Ross had no trouble getting chiefs of the Spokane and Kootenay tribes to entrust their sons to him for the trip. The two boys chosen were given the names of Spokane Garry and Kootenay Pelly by Simpson and arrived at the Red River early in the summer of 1825. They spent four and a half years there receiving a

good grounding in English, the Bible, the Book of Common Prayer, and in simple agriculture. Their teachers intended these young men to be used as assistants to the missionaries which they hoped the Church Missionary Society would soon send to their more distant tribes.

In the summer of 1830 Spokane Garry and Kootenay Pelly returned home and were received with great rejoicing. They told their own and neighboring tribes what they had learned about Christianity, and such was the breakdown of the old tribal religion, that their tribes immediately adopted the simple Christianity they expounded.

They began to keep the Lord's Day free from work, to say prayers night and morning according to a simple form based on the Daily Offices of the Book of Common Prayer, to say grace before eating, and to take as the basis of their morality the Ten Commandments with the explanation of these as given in the catechism of the Book of Common Prayer. Garry and Pelly gave their kinsmen to understand that ministers were called "Black Robes," as the Anglicans were known at the Red River. (The Roman Catholics were called Long Robes.)³ Two native customs—gambling and plurality of wives—were not disturbed by the primitive form of Anglicanism these young men introduced, probably because they were too deeply entrenched, and also because at the Red River Mission both of these were all too commonly practiced. Also, as one man reminded me, "There is nothing in the catechism of the Church of England condemning either gambling or a plurality of wives."

The religion these two introduced spread in concentric circles from their home area, and, mixed with some native customs, became a vital factor in the lives of many tribes in the plateau region of Oregon. So intense was the interest shown that, when in the spring of 1831, Spokane Garry and Kootenay Pelly returned to the Red River Mission they took with them five additional young Indians: Spokane Berens, Kootenay Collins, Cayuse Halket, and two Nez Perces, Ellis and Pitt.

The seven young Indians from Oregon were all studying at the school during the winter of 1831-32, but that spring Kootenay Pelly died. Garry was sent back with the news of his death, and when he did not return to the school, all the others were sent home, except possibly Spokane Berens who died at the Mission in April 1834. Cayuse Halket after a year at home returned to the Red River but died after an accident at a neighboring Indian Camp. Kootenay Collins died shortly after his return home, leaving only Spokane Garry and the two Nez Perces, Ellis and Pitt, to carry on.⁴

Traders, trappers and scientists visiting the Oregon country during the 1830's report seeing Indians at Christian worship, and often referred to the tribes that sent young men to the Red River as "Chris-

tian" Indians. That these tribes were greatly interested in Christianity is shown by the fact that after Garry's and Pelly's visit home in 1830, a Nez Perce band, which did not send a representative back to the Red River Mission, sent four of its chiefs eastward to learn more about the white man's religion. It is my opinion that they were seeking the Church of England Mission at the Red River but got lost and were diverted by American trappers to St. Louis. Their interest in religion was made known but none of the churches in St. Louis at the time seemed to them to correspond to what they were looking for—the mission and Indian school at the Red River. Only one survived to return to his tribe and he reported failure in the search—further evidence that they were seeking not the white man's religion in general but a particular place where it was practiced.

The appearance of these four Nez Percés finally reached the newspapers in a somewhat garbled form, and set off a world-wide interest in the Christianization of the Indians of Oregon. The white man's economic penetration, limited to fur trading, was to be supplemented by its twin, the missionary.

The first penetration was made by the Methodists who, in 1834, sent the Reverend Jason Lee and four others to establish a mission to the Indians of Oregon. Although sent to the "Flatheads," as these Indians were generally designated in eastern circles, the Methodists actually settled in the Willamette valley. Owing to epidemics of the white man's diseases, the valley was almost depopulated of Indians, and French Canadian ex-employees of the Hudson's Bay Company were settling there.

The Methodists did open an Indian School, but, owing to the high death rate among those Indians who came, it was discontinued within a few years. In fact within four years Jason Lee himself reached the conclusion that the future of the mission lay with the expected incoming white migration. Late in 1834 he succeeded in getting the Methodist Board to give him an appropriation of \$40,000 for his work. He took three young Indians east with him for propaganda purposes, but his own efforts in Oregon were largely devoted to the economic advancement of the mission. His wife wrote, upon one occasion, that "Mr. Lee is a man of business, I assure you."⁵ Attempts were made in 1840 after the arrival of reinforcements to establish other mission stations, but with the exception of the one at The Dalles, they either failed or soon limited themselves to the incoming whites.

By 1843 the Methodist Missionary Society had become dissatisfied with the results of its mission to the Indians of Oregon under Jason Lee, and the following year sent out the Reverend George Gary with full powers to replace Lee. Finding the whole work as much an economic

venture as a religious one, Gary decided to liquidate these non-religious activities. When he was through, only the Indian work at The Dalles remained; and elsewhere only eight Indians were on the rolls of the Church. In 1847 the mission at The Dalles was sold and Methodism was out of the business of converting the Indians. Few had been the converts from such a large expenditure of men and money. The dream of a future white settlement of the region had over-shadowed and destroyed the missionary vision. The dichotomy in western man had wrought its havoc without any consciousness of the conflict among those who were responsible for the failure.

The second missionary penetration was made by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in 1835. They sent the Reverend Samuel Parker and Dr. Marcus Whitman to investigate the situation among Indians of Oregon in the spring of 1835. The two got as far as the Green River Rendezvous in Wyoming where Whitman turned back for reinforcements while Parker went on to Fort Vancouver. In the spring of 1836 Parker visited the interior tribes and was much surprised to find them aware of Christianity. When he preached to some Spokanes they told him that Garry had told them about Jesus, and later he saw the tule-mat school-house and church Garry had built on the bank of the Spokane River. Parker was much impressed with the superior moral behaviour of the Indians of the tribes which had sent young men back to the Red River and adopted the primitive Anglicanism they had brought back as compared to that of the tribes he saw on the lower Columbia.⁶ In the spring of 1836 Parker returned to Boston via the Hawaiian Islands.

That same spring Marcus Whitman accompanied by his bride and the Reverend Henry Harmon Spalding and his bride crossed the plains and entered Oregon. After a brief stay at Fort Vancouver, Whitman opened a mission at Waiilatpu, about 10 miles from Walla Walla, while Spalding opened one at Lapwai, Idaho, about one hundred and twenty miles further east. Although it was the intention of the Board that Spalding be the missionary and Whitman the medical man at a joint mission, the two men could not get along together and so opened separate establishments. The Indians were glad to receive them. Spalding observed the Indians at Christian prayer and worship, and noted that they called him "a Black Coat,"⁷ as he translated the term.

In 1838 three additional missionaries, the Reverend Elkanah Walker, the Reverend Cushing Eells and the Reverend Asa Bowen Smith arrived accompanied by their wives. Walker and Eells opened a mission at Tshaimakain among the Spokanes, and Smith opened one at Kamiah among the Nez Percés. At all four stations these Protestant missionaries observed the Indians at Christian worship and prayers,

yet in every case, instead of building on this primitive Christianity, they opposed it bitterly. Let me quote from Smith:

As a field for missionary labor, this seems to be one of peculiar interest —The people seem truly to be seeking after the truth. . . . They seem to be very conscientious with regard to the observance of the sabbath and morning and evening prayers, but with most of them the character of the Pharisee is plain to be seen.⁸

As a general thing these people consider themselves already good. They have thrown away their old hearts as they say, that is they have left off their old practices of lying, stealing, and are now worshipping God and giving heed to his word. Hence they are indeed Pharisees, resting on their own good works. . .⁹

Lest this be thought an extreme statement, let me quote from Eells who spent nine years among the Spokanes:

It has been a rather general impression among the best informed Indians, that thieves, gamblers, Sabbath-breakers, and such like will go to a place of misery when they die. But such as are not guilty of open vices and attend to a form of worship will go above. We have labored much to correct this and kindred errors.¹⁰

His co-worker among the Spokanes, Walker wrote:

The truth which we have labored to impress upon their minds, is that we are all by nature sinful, that without a change of heart we must all perish; & the doctrine of the atonement. That we may leave off all our bad practices & still our hearts not be right in the sight of God; & if, we died in this state, we certainly perish.¹¹

It is not to be wondered that Spokane Garry did not co-operate with these missionaries, who severely criticised his efforts to Christianize his people.

These missionaries were not only critical of the Indians, they were also critical of each other. In 1842 the American Board wrote ordering the closing of the stations except at Wailatpu and the discharge of some of the staff. But the missionaries had composed some of their differences, and Whitman rode east to Boston and secured a continuation of the undertaking.

At each of their establishments the missionaries helped the Indians in the art of cultivation of the soil, held schools to teach both children and adults to read and write, and endeavored to inculcate in the Indians their own brand of Christianity. However, with the exception of Spalding who admitted eleven Indians to baptism, and was criticized by the others for so doing, not one Indian was accepted into the Christian Church by all of the others in the entire eleven years of the project. Smith spent only a short time at Kamiah and left. Walker and Eells made friends with the Spokanes and Spalding made a few friends among the Nez Percés but toward the end had more enemies. Whitman alienated the entire Cayuse tribe who were aware of his dream for settling their lands with whites. By 1847 the American Board was considering closing the project out, and indeed few missionary works have

produced less results. Their dreams of the day when the land would be occupied by whites left them with little real concern for the Indians. The dichotomy within their souls was playing havoc with their mission.

The third penetration was from England. In 1836 the Hudson's Bay Company sent the Reverend Herbert Beaver, a clergyman of the Church of England, to Fort Vancouver as "chaplain and missionary to the Indians." Beaver was completely unfitted for the type of life at the fort and within days of his arrival got into an argument with Dr. McLoughlin, the chief factor, that completely blinded him to his proper purpose. Beaver's two years at the fort accomplished nothing in so far as the Indians were concerned.

The fourth penetration came from Canada when in response to a petition from the French Canadian settlers on the Willamette, prepared and sent east by Dr. McLoughlin, whose sister was a nun, two Roman Catholic priests arrived with the Hudson's Bay Express in the fall of 1838. Fathers Francis Nortbert Blanchet and Modesta Demers crossed the Rocky Mountains on October 14, 1838, and reported that at celebration of the Mass the Indians "assisted with as much respect as if they had been fervent Christians."¹² They noted the use of the term "Black Gown,"¹³ as they translated it, for a minister among the Cayuses and other tribes, indicating that such a term was unknown to them east of the Rockies. Writing in 1840 Blanchet reported the use of the term among the Indians on Whidby Island and that ten years earlier they had first heard of the Master of Heaven.¹⁴ This gives the date 1830 at which time the teaching of Garry and Pelly were spreading so rapidly. Blanchet and Demers travelled up and down the coast as well as making trips into the interior, and baptised hundreds of Indians.

Their work was reinforced when the fifth penetration took place in 1841. Jesuit Peter DeSmet entered the country of the Flatheads and Pend d'Oreilles in the summer of 1840 and found them practicing night and morning prayers. He too noted the use of the word "Black Gown,"¹⁵ as he translated it, and the desire of the Indians for further instruction. He spent two months instructing them and then baptised some six hundred of the two tribes before he returned to St. Louis on August 27. Wisely, and quite unlike the Protestant missionaries, he had built on the simple Christianity the Indians had learned from the young men educated at the Red River Mission of the Church of England. The following year he returned with five others and established St. Mary's Mission in the Bitter Root valley in western Montana. Soon a mission was established among the Coeur d'Alenes and a work begun at Fort Colville. Late in 1847 the Bishop of Walla Walla, A. M. A. Blanchet, arrived to establish a mission among the Cayuse Indians on the Umatilla. In the Pacific Northwest including lower British Columbia, the

Roman Catholics claimed six thousand Indian members, a rough count no doubt, but a real indication of their greater success among the Indians. The association of many of the French Canadian priests with the Hudson's Bay Company did much to advance their work among the natives. Although the Roman Catholic Church did not neglect its work among the incoming whites, few of whom were of that denomination, the church in all of its institutions was careful not to draw any racial distinction. Far less than the Protestants were these servants of God infected by the feeling so prevalent among Americans of the nineteenth century that it was their manifest destiny to control the North American continent from ocean to ocean.

After the year 1842 the tide of white immigration to Oregon increased rapidly, and so did the concern of the Indians of the region for their lands. With the depopulation of the Willamette valley of Indians and their replacement by whites obvious for all to see, and with their fears stirred by the reports of eastern Indians who came to live among them of what had happened to them, the Indians of Oregon became hostile to the whites and to the Americans, whom they called Bostons, in particular. In spite of the evident help in the way of education in the white man's ways provided by the missions, it was all too evident to the Indians that the missionaries, with the possible exception of the French-Canadians, were obviously on the side of the incoming tide of whites. A tension began to grow up around the missions, especially at Wailatpu where Dr. Whitman had long given up any effort to convert the Indians and was dreaming of the day when the countryside would be occupied by American settlers. In the fall of 1847, discouraged, he had his nephew, Perrin Whitman, arrange for the purchase of the Methodist mission at The Dalles; and he rode to the Umatilla to confer with the Roman Catholic Bishop concerning the possibility of selling Wailatpu to him.¹⁶ He was convinced that Narcissa would be happier at that location. But before the matter was completed the blow fell.

1846 Great Britain and the United States completed a treaty which gave to the latter country all the land south of the 49th parallel. Without being consulted in any way the Indians of Oregon found themselves under the flag of the hated Bostons. Unfortunately Congress failed to provide any territorial government for the region and in the power vacuum created by the termination of the influence of the Hudson's Bay Company the Indians felt free to take action. An epidemic that was taking many lives among the tribesmen only served to bring the matter to a head.

At St. Mary's in Montana the Flatheads deserted the mission,¹⁷ and at other points there was a slackening of interest, but at Wailatpu there was tragedy. The Cayuses were a proud tribe, and in an attempt

to stir the other tribes up to an attack upon the Bostons to save the lands of all, as well as to rid their lands of a medicine man they were convinced was bringing death to their children, they attacked Wailatpu.

Of this attack it is too often overlooked that it was probably the most humane in Indian history. With the exception of Mrs. Whitman, only men were killed and not all of them. The women and children were kindly treated and one white girl married an Indian, quite willingly, during the period of captivity.¹⁸ (This is in marked contrast to the way in which American soldiers, both regulars and volunteers, acted in earlier and subsequent Indian wars when Indian men, women and children were shot down in cold blood again and again.) The reason for this merciful behavior by the Cayuses was that they considered themselves Christians.

As a result of the Whitman massacre all Christian missions in the interior region were closed by the military. So ended the Protestant missions to Oregon, for they did not reopen until the 1870's and then under entirely different conditions. The Roman Catholics did manage to keep their work going in some places, but even they did not resume full activities until the 1870's either.

Well may 1847 be considered the close of the initial phase of Christian missions to Oregon. In spite of the Indians' desire for Christian missionaries and teachers, and in spite of the pioneering work of the young Indians educated at the Red River Mission of the Church of England, the two-pronged advance of the white man had alienated many of the natives from the missionaries and the Christian religion in just over a decade. The white man's belief that the land was his to take without regard for the Indian's rights, and the missionaries' obvious sympathy for the settler rather than those they came to convert, caused a reversion among the tribesmen. Many reverted to the ancient Dreamer religion of their fathers, while others were to continue for another generation in the primitive Christianity brought back from the Red River. The dichotomy in western culture had served to the disadvantage of the Christian religion, and had created a racial tension that was to eventuate in war within a few years.

1. John R. Jewett, *Narrative of the Adventures and Suffering of John R. Jewett; only survivor of the crew of the Ship Boston, during a captivity of nearly three years among the Savages of Nootka Sound* (Middletown, Conn., 1815), pp. 21-182.

2. *The Missionary Herald*, (Boston, Mass.), XXIII, 396-397.

3. John West, *The Substance of a Journal*

during a residence at the Red River Colony, British North America; and frequent excursions among the North-West American Indians in the years 1820, 1821, 1822, 1823 (London, 1824), p. 91.

4. Thomas E. Jessett, "The Church of England in the Old Oregon Country," *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, XVII, 197-205.

5. Cornelius J. Brosnan, *Jason Lee, Prophet of the New Oregon* (New York, 1932), pp. 142-275.
6. Samuel Parker, *Journal of an Exploring Tour beyond the Rocky Mountains, under the direction of the A.B.C.F.M. performed in the Years 1835, '36 and '37* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1838) pp. 100-314.
7. Clifford M. Drury, *Henry Harmon Spalding* (Caldwell, Idaho, 1936), p. 148.
8. Smith to Greene, September 15, 1838, American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, *Letters and Papers*, Volume 138, pp. 296-297. (Typescript in Oregon Historical Society Library, Portland, Oregon).
9. Smith to Greene, February 6, 1840, *Ibid.*, p. 369.
10. *The Missionary Herald*, (Boston Mass.), 1841, p. 435.
11. Walker to Greene, *Letters and Papers*, *op. cit.*, p. 492.
12. "Missions de la Colombie," *Rapport sur les Missions du Diocese de Quebec, qui sont secourues par l'association de la Propagation de la Foi*, (Quebec, Canada), January 1840, p. 20.
13. In French, "robe-noire."
14. *Ibid.*, January 1842, p. 69.
15. Peter J. DeSmet, *Letters and Sketches with a Narrative of a Year's Residence Among the Indian Tribes of the Rocky Mountains* in Reuben Gold Thwaites, ed., *Travels in the Far West, 1836-1841* (Cleveland, 1906), XXVII, 141-143.
16. George W. Fuller, *A History of the Pacific Northwest* (New York, 1941), p. 146.
17. Gilbert J. Garraghan, *The Jesuits in the Middle United States* (New York, 1938), II, 270, 276-278.
18. Mary Smith, daughter of one of the white men who was not killed, and Edward, son of the Cayuse Chief Tilaukait, were married Indian fashion. When the whites were rescued the young couple parted reluctantly.

1960 Brewer Prize Contest

The American Society of Church History announces that its next Brewer Prize competition for a book-length manuscript in church history will conclude in 1960. The award will be announced at the annual meeting of the Society in December of that year. It will consist of a subsidy of one thousand dollars to assist the author in the publication of the winning manuscript, which shall be described on its title-page as the "Frank S. and Elizabeth D. Brewer Prize Essay of the American Society of Church History" and shall be published in a manner acceptable to the Society. If competing essays are otherwise of equal quality, preference will be given to those dealing with topics related to the history of Congregationalism. Complete manuscripts in final form, fully annotated, must be in the hands of the Secretary, Professor Winthrop S. Hudson, 1100 South Goodman St., Rochester 20, New York, by September 15, 1960. There must be two copies, a typescript and a first carbon, on standard weight paper, double-spaced, with a left-hand margin of at least an inch and one-half.

NINETEENTH CENTURY THEOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL INFLUENCES ON ADOLF HARNACK

G. WAYNE GLICK, *Franklin and Marshall College*

There are growing evidences of a sense of concern with respect to the interpretation accorded Adolf Harnack and his liberal colleagues in the three decades since his death. As a result, appeals have been made for a re-evaluation of liberal theology, and of Harnack in particular. Certainly one of the tasks which is pre-requisite to such a re-assessment is a consideration of the historical situation which shaped Harnack's thought and in some measure, at least, determined the options for his own position. Perhaps this article may contribute to this preliminary discussion, and nothing more ambitious than a consideration of Harnack's background and cultural environment, with a concluding characterization of his position, will be attempted here.

It is the contention of this article that an evaluation of four nineteenth century influences is absolutely essential to an understanding of Harnack. First, the neo-confessionalism of Dorpat and Erlangen, with its ecclesiological passion and its ecclesiastical suzerainty, its not inconsiderable interest in history, and its Christological concern, provided one foil against which Harnack's work was set, and in relation to which he must be understood. The second significant foil was the cultural ethos resulting from the ascendancy of various forms of mechanistic thought. The influence of Baur and his Tübingen confreres, and of Ritschl, must also be considered—for customary interpretations do not err in assigning important influences on Harnack to these theological giants.

Dorpat-Erlangen

It should be made clear at the outset that "Dorpat-Erlangen" signifies not only the universities where Harnack received his early training, but also a type of theology. This type is Lutheran orthodoxy; it ruled at Dorpat and Erlangen, and at many other places in nineteenth century Germany. Particularly when one considers Harnack's relation to ecclesiastical politics, it must be remembered that this theology was in control of the councils that governed the Church.

Certainly one of the strongest influences on Harnack was his father, Theodosius, who saw to it that all of his sons obtained a solid grounding in historical, philosophical, and literary subjects.¹ But perhaps an even more determinative influence than that of the father was exerted by Moritz von Engelhardt, his Dorpat mentor and confidant. Not only did Harnack learn church history from Engelhardt, but

Engelhardt indelibly impressed upon him the necessity for meticulous textual criticism and source study in the investigation of church historical problems. Later, Harnack was to compare Engelhardt's tutelage to that of his Leipzig teachers, at no detriment to Engelhardt. Harnack's early correspondence in his Leipzig years is full of high encomiums for the method which Engelhardt had practiced and taught. Engelhardt was fully aware of and indebted to the historical conception that had stemmed from Ranke; the newer methods of historical-critical study, though transmuted in certain respects by the confessional commitments that Engelhardt held and sought to inculcate, also received their just dues. Another Dorpat influence that should not pass unnoticed was that of "The Pope," Alexander von Oettingen.² For it was from von Oettingen that Harnack derived his enthusiasm for Goethe, and this enthusiasm was to remain with Harnack throughout his life.³

It was Dorpat-Erlangen which mediated to Harnack his most existential problem, how to become Jesus' disciple.⁴ But though it was mediated through Dorpat, the content of the answer did not long remain that of the Dorpat teachers. For when Harnack came to adopt the viewpoint of Ritschl, it made necessary a transmuting of his received heritage. On three particular points he broke with this heritage, and in two others his view was altered. The first and perhaps crucial point was directly related to the central existential problem, and had to do with the doctrine of the person of Christ. In 1873 he wrote to Engelhardt that he could no longer hold to the doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ, regarding it as "originating in heathen philosophy."⁵ A year later, he is using a Ritschlian argument to answer a correspondent's question: the way to deal with this question as to Christ's person is to ask what we and the world would be like today without him, and to seek to emulate his example in bearing the cross.⁶ By the time another year had passed, he could write with assurance to Engelhardt that for him there was only one way in which this question could be dealt with, and that was to grasp the historical.⁷

The second point had to do with the valuation of the tradition. Harnack admitted that he was torn between two *Angelpunkte*: on the one hand, he found tradition to be far removed from true devotion; but on the other he could not believe that God would leave his Church without a pure tradition.⁸ The third point dealt with the sacraments, and Harnack took the position that we celebrate these because Christ has ordered it, and we ought to do what he has commanded. The grace of God and the forgiveness of sin is thus mediated to the person who takes them in faith: as to infant-baptism, Harnack admits a lack of conviction. On the point of the confessional writings, he declares that

he can accept them only in the sense of the early Reformation symbols, with the primacy given to the material principle. Finally, on the point of the forgiveness of sins, he admits an altered understanding. Forgiveness cannot be taken to mean only "something to get rid of," but it carries with it the necessity of attainment. Here, in 1876, he states "that one can learn this especially today from Ritschl," but claims that he found this out for himself, and discovered the best formulation of it in Ritschl.⁹

All the while that these theological and historical matters were being transmuted, Harnack remained existentially involved by virtue of his heritage. He confessed that the problem of the person of Christ had weighed more heavily on his heart than on his head. His father, until his death in 1889, kept a steady pressure on him, warning him that he should not fall into the camp of the destructive critics, in which he placed Ritschl, but should remain true to the Bible and the confessions. Theodosius Harnack regarded any subjectivistic elements with horror, and by act and writing sought to uphold a high ecclesiological position. There was no turning back for Adolf, however, for in his choice of friends,¹⁰ in his historical investigation, and in his apologetic work,¹¹ he had set his course. He remained something of an enigma to his friends, as he pursued his "destructive" historical labors on the one hand, and maintained a deep personal piety on the other. When asked how these things could be, he remarked that in the *Vaterunser*, the *Bergpredigt*, and the hymns of Paul Gerhardt he found resources which, taken symbolically, could enable one to "follow Christ" in spite of conflicts.¹² In fact, he held tenaciously to the belief that the old and the new theology could be reconciled, as is evident from his correspondence during the early Giessen period with Ritschl, Luthardt, Engelhardt, and his father.

It is clear that Harnack stood in the main stream of nineteenth century theological interest: the problems of the century, Jesus, Christian dogma, and the Church, were his problems. As the channel by means of which the basic problems were communicated to him, the conservative position represented by Dorpat remained a part of Harnack's internal environment. The problem of the "central redemptive personality" remained his problem, though the content he was to put into this term was transformed. The "ideas of the Protestant ecclesiastical tradition" shaped the direction of his thought, though again a great transformation took place. But it was Harnack's relation to the ecclesiastical institution in imperial Germany that provided the existential stress which was never to be overcome.

In 1906 Harnack became librarian of the Royal Library in Berlin. He had discussed this *Nebenruf* with Rade in correspondence during

the preceding year, and in the course of one of his letters had made a significant statement with respect to his relation to the Church:

You learn to know the world only insofar as you influence it. My new position will not make me so much a 'librarian' as an organizer. I hope that my friends will find that theology does not lose thereby, but that science, and theology also, will win. I have *done* so little in my life, and I would like to supplement my lectures and writings in a modest way by an *action* from which the entire community profits. The church has not offered me an opportunity in this regard, and such work would now come too late for me.¹³

This is certainly classical understatement. Though Harnack had, in his writings, avowed his concern for the defense of Protestantism—understood under its Ritschlian form, to be sure—though he had been actively interested since his Leipzig years in the "social question" in the Church, though he had supported foreign missions in numerous writings, though he had been president of the *Evangelisch-Soziale Kongress* for three years at the time of the writing of this letter, and was to continue for five more, though he was active in the Inner Mission, though he was co-founder and president of the Evangelical Union, yet he was in large measure *persona non grata* to the institutional church and its leaders. That he never ceased to regard himself as standing in debt to the Church is certain, as is the fact that he regarded his work as being for the good of the Church.¹⁴

Ritschl, like Harnack's Dorpat teachers, had emphasized that the only true standpoint of the Christian theologian must be within the Church. On the basis of his historical pursuits, however, he had come to regard the Church in its ideality as something quite different from that Church described by the confessionalism of his time. He was under constant attack, therefore, but with a dogged devotion he worked out his theology on the basis of his viewpoint. Harnack agreed with Ritschl as to the standpoint of the theologian; he agreed with Ritschl's historical judgment of the contemporary church; and because of his historical judgments he, perhaps more than Ritschl, became the favorite target of the orthodox. The defenders of the tradition took his "characteristic judgments" as mortal threats, and engaged Harnack for a good portion of his life in earnest and prolonged controversy.

The first major controversy broke out shortly after Harnack had moved to Giessen. Removed from rigid confessional patterns, Harnack had objectively evaluated the old and the new theology, and had cast his lot with the new. His *Dogmengeschichte*, written here, had as a subsidiary motive, so he declared, the freeing of himself from the confessional war; but if he meant more than a personal emancipation, he could hardly have been more wrong.¹⁵ For it was his method of handling church dogma that cost him a chair at Leipzig, and set the defenders of ecclesiastical orthodoxy on his trail. After a short tenure at Marburg,

when the Berlin appointment was broached, another controversy broke out. In Prussia, the Evangelical *Oberkirchenrat* had the right to question anyone called to Berlin as to his doctrinal and confessional position. The council was split, but one of those who took a neutral position, Brückner, wrote to Harnack, asking for a statement of his views on the Resurrection and on baptism as a sacrament. Harnack merely referred him to his published writings. The ecclesiastical press of Prussia was against him, with Stöcker's *Deutsche Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* leading the pack. When the judgment of the high consistory went to the ministry, Harnack was voted against on three counts: that he had shattered the New Testament canon, that he left open the question of miracle, and that he denied that the Trinitarian formula for baptism had been instituted by Jesus. The ministry now had a chance to reply, and Harnack had defenders in Althoff and Weiss. At this crucial juncture, Wilhelm I died and the young emperor inherited the problem. Through the instrumentality of Bismarck, Wilhelm II, previously under Stöcker's influence, made a favorable decision, with a characteristic flourish: "Ich will keine Mucker!"¹⁶

Harnack's expressed hope that he would be allowed to go about his work unimpeded proved again to be abortive. In 1892 the most bitter of all the controversies surrounding him, the *Apostolikumsstreit*, broke out. Though the problem was older than this, dating from the eighties, and including, as was customary, political factors, Harnack's involvement was precipitated when he was specifically asked for his judgment on the "Schrempf case." Schrempf, a young ecclesiastic, had performed a baptism without using the Apostles' Creed. Harnack answered the request with nine points, which he published in the *Christliche Welt*. Among them, he held that the Church should prepare a shorter confession which would be grounded in the Reformation position, and also take account of later understandings of the Gospel, and require this of all; that this is a question of the first order and requires an immediate resolution; that the handling of the question must not be such as would give the opponents of Christianity any cause for rejoicing;¹⁷ that the Apostles' Creed must either be removed from liturgical worship or its use left to the discretion of the congregations, or another creed be substituted therefor; that certain elements of the Creed cannot be interpreted in their original sense, but must be seen in the light of evangelical belief, e.g. "the communion of saints"; that the phrase of the Creed "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary" cannot be received by many believing Christians as fact; and that, as this controversy affects future ecclesiastics, there should now be required in the universities the study of the history of dogma and of symbolics.¹⁸ Harnack appended a statement in which he specified the essentials of any evangelical creed:

The essential content of the Apostles' Creed consists in the confession that in the Christian religion the goods 'holy Church,' 'forgiveness of sins,' and 'eternal life' are given, that the possession of these goods is promised to those believing in God, the Almighty Creator, in his Son Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Spirit, and that these are won through Jesus Christ our Lord. This content is evangelical.¹⁹

With this statement the controversy flared into violence. Cremer of Greifswald, an opponent whom Harnack honored, argued, in the *Christliche Welt*, against his position; but Stöcker requisitioned the columns of the *Deutsche Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* to pour out his journalistic vitriol, accusing Harnack and his ilk of "no respect for history, no honor for the confessions, no regard for the Church and community. Hypotheses, quite often giddy hypotheses . . . are given greater reality than the foundation beliefs of the Church."²⁰ Stöcker concluded with the declaration that "the confession, biblical authority, and finally the historicity and the personality of Christ himself are thrown into the witches'-kettle of frothy criticism."²¹ And at Kassel a consistorial paper printed a sonnet ending with the lines:

If the light of the world for you is Harnack,
Then he must also be your savior now.²²

The Catholic press also joined in the fray, and an unbelievable number of letters appeared in the papers, most of them opposing Harnack's position. There were supporters, however; Rade through his influential *Christliche Welt*, the *Akademie der Wissenschaften*, and—Harvard University!²³

Harnack was supported by the Ministry, and was not reproved.²⁴ It is of significance in closing this episode to report that though there were a great many requests that poured in to Harnack, including one from his brother Otto, asking him to make explicit what he would put in the place of the Apostles' Creed, he refused to do this. On the one hand, he confessed a great fear of agitators, for he held that in any agitation the truth suffers; on the other hand, he affirmed that he was not willing to destroy the faith that meant so much to so many people. Thus, though he was accused of weakness, he took as his text "Ich bin kein Reformator," and insofar as possible remained silent.²⁵

The *Apostolikumsstreit* can stand as paradigm for Harnack's relation to the ecclesiastical authorities of his day, but there were many subsequent occasions when he came into conflict with them. After the publication of *Das Wesen des Christentums*, he was challenged from many sides for his statement that "the Father alone, and not the Son, belongs in the Gospel as Jesus preached it."²⁶ Two years previous to this he had declared to Rade his intention to continue in his vocation of serving the Church and serving science at the same time;²⁷ this in spite of the fact that the Church would not even let Harnack act as examiner

for his own students. A year after the publication of *Das Wesen des Christentums*, Harnack had desired to be appointed as the faculty representative to the meeting of the Brandenburg Synod, but when he contacted his friends to inquire whether this would be possible, they retorted that it would be an affront to the Synod if Harnack were appointed.²⁸ Even the liberal party among the churchmen did not find Harnack acceptable, for Harnack held that the Church was too much dominated by the ecclesiastics, and in his appeal for more lay participation he found few supporters. The sole place where his interest in action could be exercised was in those extra-Church movements and organizations to which we have already referred. Certainly it is clear that the Dorpat-Erlangen influence, taken in its widest sense as including those who controlled the Church institutionally, was an ambivalent one as it affected Harnack. Though he was a son of Dorpat-Erlangen, he was a son in protest; and this "foil" must be set in proper perspective in order to understand him.

Mechanistic Materialism

This influence which we have designated as "mechanistic materialism" is almost totally a negative one, and yet we believe that it is of inestimable importance. By this term we mean minimally that representation of human life which rests on non-theistic assumptions. This view was set forth in varying ways by Feuerbach, Schopenhauer, Vogt, Moleschott, Darwin (and his German interpreter, Hæckel), Marx and his interpreters, and a veritable host of lesser personages. Harnack will rarely mention these men by name. It is clear, however, that from the beginning of his scholarly activity he is aware of their influence in the cultural background, and of their challenge to any "religious" interpretation of human existence; thus they require an answer from the Christian theologian. In the early correspondence, Harnack had set forth as a fundamental purpose of his life to "defend" the concept of Christianity won by historical investigation.²⁹ In his *Christianity and History* he goes to special pains to make clear that when he speaks of "development," a particular dissociation from the current mechanistic-materialistic determinism of his time must be insisted on.³⁰ In dealing with the relation of ecclesiastical to general history, he takes occasion to lash out at the Marxian view that all intellectual life and higher development can be explained on the materialistic economic-determinism hypothesis.³¹

One can see the importance of this contemporary influence in paradigm when its relation to Harnack's interpretation of scripture is considered. Harnack explicitly admits, in his essay on "The Double Gospel in the New Testament,"³² that his formulation of the position there set forth has been determined by the contemporary situation. He

then refers to the fact that mechanistic materialism has denied any validity to Christianity. Two points need to be noted here. The first is Harnack's claim that this denial rests on a *false* historical view as to what Christianity *really* is.³³ The second point worthy of note is the utilitarianism in his argument. Christianity *must* be defended against mechanistic materialism; to do this, one must demonstrate on a scientific historical basis, against these thinkers (but also *for* these thinkers?), what the Gospel really is. Harnack claims to do this on the basis of historical truth. But what he is actually using as the basis of his argument here is the contemporary *value* of the Gospel. The "second" Gospel cannot suffice to meet the contemporary challenge; the "first" Gospel, interpreted in terms of Kantian ethics, can. Therefore, the Gospel must be interpreted under this latter form.

It is to be noted further that the mode of development of his argument buttresses this conclusion. Scientific (historical) investigation is implicitly lauded as the only way to truth in the affirmation that any statement that does not begin, proceed, and end with his (Jesus') historical existence must be abjured.³⁴ Revelation is here cut to the necessary measure; it "can only take place in the uniqueness of personal life, and only the result that issues in history can tell us whether God has so acted through individuals."³⁵ These are "results" that can be studied "scientifically." Finally, then, even in his valiant and necessary attempt to save the uniqueness of Jesus, the apologetic situation with respect to the culture is apparent, perhaps to the detriment of the question of truth: Jesus is unique because history has found in him a way to a "personal higher life" which "overcomes the world."

It is obvious in this connection that what Harnack cannot say argues as decisively as that which he says. For though he had declared in numerous writings that there are two fundamental foci which are the objects of man's concern, "God and the soul,"³⁶ in actual practice these are not the true foci. Rather than God, the *world* is the "given" that confronts the liberal, and the relation of the soul to this world becomes his overarching problem. For of these two things one can speak with some assurance that one will be heard in an age when autonomous reason reigns. To speak of God is immediately to insert the concept of mystery into religion, at least from Harnack's point of view. The only option then is to speak of revelation in such a way that it can be drawn within the orbit of man's experience, and therefore can be known by him. It is Jesus in the full range of his humanity, as one who provides the power to overcome the world, to whom Harnack looks for the answer. And if the Church should agree, but claim that there is a mystery in the relation of Jesus as Christ and God as Father, Harnack could only say, with Ritschl, "Where I find mystery, I say nothing about it."³⁷ Harnack then proceeds to examine Jesus' teaching in the

light of the necessities of the situation, and what stands forth as the "first Gospel" is Kantian ethics with a nimbus.

Though we shall consider later this Kantian contribution to Harnack as it was refracted through Ritschl, a summary statement is in place here. Harnack as historian would have held different positions from those of Kant, particularly with respect to the estimate of the worth of historical study, but at the point of metaphysical skepticism he agreed completely. Kant also had sought to save faith by identifying it with the practical reason, investing the postulates thereof with the full Deist meaning. His contribution to Harnack lies in this positive identification of religion as the highest ethical striving. Harnack's identification of the "first" Gospel, "as Jesus taught it",³⁸ is, in effect, nothing else than the three postulates of the practical reason. "The ethical, life with God"³⁹ is declared to be of almost equal power with the laws of nature. The new which came into history in Jesus Christ is the ethical ideal of the Kingdom of God, a kingdom of ethical ends which lays its demands upon us.⁴⁰ It is "the ordinary canons of morality" which Jesus invoked, and from which "he expected everything."⁴¹ Thus we affirm as a tentative conclusion that Kant's ethics is to a considerable degree determinative of the content which Harnack places in the highest form of religion, and we agree with Troeltsch that for Harnack Christianity was essentially "the preaching of Jesus concerning the Kingdom of God interpreted in terms of Kantian ethics."⁴²

We believe it is clear that Harnack is trying to "confess and defend" Christianity, but that he is caught in the necessities of a situation which subordinated even his fundamental question of truth to the question of contemporary efficacy and value.

In this apologetic purpose with respect to culture, Harnack, as we shall see, takes his cue from Ritschl. For Ritschl felt that his vocation was not only to combat "catholicism" as it maintained a residual, though covert, status in pietistic circles in his time, but even more to combat the mechanistic materialism which was sweeping over Germany in the second half of the century. The de-humanization of man which resulted from these monistic interpretations provided the challenge which Ritschl and Harnack sought to meet, a fact often given insufficient attention.

A closely related influence should also be noted here, viz., that growing out of Harnack's relationship with Overbeck, "the unbelieving theologian." Harnack admitted during the Leipzig years that Overbeck's criticism of his attempted "mediation" had been a "wounding" one.⁴³ Overbeck had challenged the liberals at two crucial points; he regarded their interpretation of early Christianity as a massive hysteron-proteron in which contemporary progress optimism was read back into

the beliefs of the primitive eschatological community; and he had taken a Marxist-Nietzschean line with respect to the contemporary situation, regarding modern civilization as hopelessly corrupt. Harnack was congenitally unable to be negative, and if he understood the full significance of Overbeck's criticism, he rejected it as providing no direction for the future. Rather, he took the criticism, characteristically enough, at the point where it could have value: in its challenging of the old orthodoxy as "risking nothing."⁴⁴ With this Harnack was in agreement, and he accepted this minimal criticism; but in this acceptance, it may be argued, he made it impossible that the more basic challenge could be assimilated and met.

Harnack's situation, then, with respect to the contemporary cultural challenge, was essentially ambivalent. He had to speak to culture, but he had to defend Christianity. The solution of this problem has been perennially vexing to Christian thinkers, and Harnack was no exception. But the fact that it was *this* problem that motivated much of his work, and determined the norm on the basis of which his thought developed, is what we wish to emphasize here. He did not solve the problem, if indeed it is capable of "a" solution. But to understand him, one must be aware of the threat which he felt from mechanistic materialism. This much is certain: Harnack did not evade, and he did not escape, involvement in the intellectual warfare that raged during his lifetime. Nowhere is this fidelity to "becoming involved" more patent than in his challenging of the mechanistic interpretations of human existence which have dominated intellectual circles since 1850. But it may be argued that because he did not meet Overbeck's challenges, nor correctly identify the "wound" which Overbeck inflicted, his own solution to the problem of Christianity and culture has proved to be as questionably valid as those against which he contended.⁴⁵

Baur and Tübingen

It was the judgment of Troeltsch that Harnack was the first person since Baur to make a real place for "Church History" within the domain of theology, and within contemporary cultural circles.⁴⁶ Troeltsch goes further, however, in portraying the likenesses between these two men. Each represents a high point in scientific theology. Each founded an influential school. Each tried to draw together into a living unity his system of doctrine and his history.⁴⁷ Troeltsch, writing out of his massive understanding of nineteenth century historical development, believes that the likenesses between these two intellectual giants were obscured to the epigones of the Baur school and the forerunners of the Harnack school. Even Harnack "at the beginning probably judged similarly."⁴⁸ But increasingly in Harnack's writing, "one feels a strong emphasis on the idea of a general develop-

ment of the spirit, almost in the sense of the dialectic of Hegel, within which dialectic the development of Christian institutions and the Christian spirit were imbedded."⁴⁹ This judgment cannot be lightly dismissed, but requires that an assessment of the Tübingen influence on Harnack be attempted, particularly as it is seen in Baur.

Baur's significance lies in the fact that he was the first historian to apply seriously the methods of critical empirical investigation to the history of the Church—in this respect, indeed, he was a *Bahnbrecher*—and in the fact that he insisted that one must always be seeking for interpretative principles by which the flux of historical event can be given meaning. The interpretative principles which Baur employed were Hegelian. The philosophy of religion which subsumed the Hegelian attempt at a dogmatic, as essayed by Baur and his school, was deduced from a definite conception of the divine nature and of the logical principles of its evolution. Hegel's view of history, in which the Absolute Idea is seen as slowly coming to its fulfillment through the rational working of the process of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, fascinated Baur. In this view, Christianity was regarded as "the self-realization of the divine spirit in a historical movement which redeems finite spirits to itself."⁵⁰ Seen as a logically necessary result of the history of religion completing the self-evolution of the divine spirit, Christianity represents the perfect religious idea actually come to expression. Dogmatics is therefore nothing else than the exposition of the content of the God-Idea, absolute and final both for philosophy and religion. Such a dogmatics should make clear that the content of the God-Idea is the real inner meaning of the traditional ecclesiastical formulæ, and should be practically expounded as such.

Not only in his Hegelian interpretative scheme, however, did Baur contribute to the era in which he worked. Indeed, the Hegelian interpretation rapidly passed out of favor. Idealistic monism had attempted to bring nature, man, and God within its rationalistic orbit, but it was overcome, at least temporarily, by the multiple blows of an intellectually creative century. Whatever Hegel might have thought of this crowning achievement of all thought, there were options which, when actualized, pronounced the Hegelian achievement relative like all other intellectual syntheses.⁵¹ Marx and Kierkegaard contributed to the dissolution, each transforming the absolute philosophy of spirit in his own way: Marx by his analysis of the external conditions of the life of the masses, challenging the bourgeois capitalist world, and Kierkegaard by his analysis of the internal existence of the individual, challenging the bourgeois Christian world and Christian secularism.⁵²

Baur had criticized the rationalists of his time for their "mere" empiricism and the orthodox historians like Neander for their lack of

an interpretative principle that emerged out of the material itself.⁵³ He believed that he had discovered in the Hegelian philosophy the means by which the errors of his contemporaries could be corrected. When he adopted Hegelian philosophical categories, however, he in turn was criticized by Hase and later by Ritschl for depersonalizing man and failing to take history in its full concreteness. Ritschl eviscerated from his thought not only Hegelian speculation, but all forms of speculation. What he did not reject, however, when he turned away from Tübingen, was Baur's historical-critical method. Dilthey in 1865 made a judgment concerning Baur which has been repeated many times since: that Baur, because of his insistence on understanding Christianity as a historical phenomenon, ranks with Schleiermacher as an equal genius given to German evangelical theology in the nineteenth century.⁵⁴ But because this was a period in which an old norm was passing and a new was being born, and because this was probably not recognized even by those participating in the process, much of Baur's significance was ignored. Further, when his Hegelianism was rejected, many of his particular interpretations of early church history were rejected also. What remained as his enduring contribution, however, was his understanding that Christianity must be viewed as a historical phenomenon, and investigated by a historical-critical method. In this respect Harnack was his heir, in spite of the fact that he rejected many of Baur's specific formulations.

Harnack assessed the significance of Baur and the Tübingen school, and the advances made in the generation following, in a lecture given at Giessen in 1885, entitled "The Present State of Research in Early Church History."⁵⁵ In this lecture, he contrasted the viewpoints held by the Tübingen school with those held in 1885, and then specified the causes for the "advance." The enlargement of viewpoint which he sees involves no startling novelty in point of departure, but a further development of that which was implicit in Baur's historical-critical method. It is significant that in stating one of the contrasts Harnack declares that though Baur had concentrated on images, conceptions, and dogmatic statements, "today we have learned that the Christian religion was, above everything else, a new life and a new form of human society."⁵⁶ Certainly the Ritschlian influence is clearly marked in this differentiation and restatement. A further significant clue to understanding Harnack is to be found in the first "cause" which he lists as responsible for the advance in church historical studies. The science of history, he holds, has been emancipated from its slavery to philosophical systems. After the death of rationalism, romanticism provided a wholesome reaction, but it was no more than that. It, too, had to be overcome, by means of a genuinely historical temper.

And here we dissent from Harnack's judgment if he means what

he appears to mean. For we hold that romanticism was not overcome, at least in Harnack, but that it was repressed in favor of "richer historical points of view." Joining with his Ritschlian axiology, it emerged increasingly in his later years as an *Humanitätslehre*, counterpoised to his historicist tendencies.

If this is true, a brief consideration of those aspects of romanticism which influenced Harnack and which evidence themselves in his thought is in order here.

It is, of course, a commonplace of the cultural historian that romanticism is amorphous and indefinable. Nevertheless, certain descriptive features may be here set forth, features which became the common possession of nineteenth century German thought. The romantic is above all impressed by the richness and variety of the experiences which the individual discovers in the world; at the same time, he is obsessed with the necessity to bring into a unified synthesis all that is knowable in the realms of nature, history, and art. Completeness is his passion, and therefore he announces himself an enemy of such restrictive systems as that of the Enlightenment. History above all else becomes the means by which man's fullest appreciation of himself and his world is to be actualized. But this is no narrow concept of history; history as the romantic conceived it meant *Geist*. And this "spirit that prevails in history"⁵⁷ must be revered as one studies the personalities and the development which history manifests.

It was a further characteristic of romanticism that it tended to separate religion and metaphysics,⁵⁸ and Harnack is clearly influenced by this tendency. Such a separation tends to obscure the close relation of faith and truth,⁵⁹ and it has been cogently argued that there were signs of such a fissiparity in Harnack.⁶⁰

It is particularly in his *Humanitätslehre*, with which his axiological norm is so intimately involved, that Harnack shows the marked influence of romanticism. This doctrine of humanity shows many striking parallels to the doctrine held by the early leader of the group, Herder. Herder's "humanity" was a complex fusion of many elements, including feeling, individuality, and religion, which is the highest humanity. History, when it is properly seen in all its concrete reality, reveals to us the developing city of God on earth. This passionate concern for the concrete reality of history, it has been adjudged, made possible a new approach to the problems of theology.⁶¹ For Herder, God is to be found in the common experience of history, and revelation is nothing else than the meeting of spirit with spirit in living men. It is through great men that God speaks in his self-mediation, and through such great men culture is shaped and transmitted. Evil in such a view can mean nothing more than incompleteness, and Christ is the enlightener who speaks to

our humanity through his own, meeting this incompleteness. Any Christology which goes beyond this must be abjured. The Bible therefore is to be read in order that the spirit of the living man who stands at its center—Jesus—may speak to our spirit. It is through his pure human understanding of God as Father and men as brothers that he is validated to our understanding as pre-eminent—and in no other way. Herder was particularly incensed at those productions which questioned the concrete historical particularity of Jesus.

Harnack, we maintain, would have been able to assert every one of these propositions! History had refined its method, to be sure, and here or there a minor change in emphasis might therefore have been necessitated. But at that point which is *the* crucial point in understanding Harnack, the axiological norm embodied in the *Humanitätslehre*, the influence of romanticism is decisive.

Ritschl

In the second edition of his *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, published in 1857, Ritschl declared:

When I prepared *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche* in its first form, I was in a position to raise a number of differences with certain representations of the Tübingen school; but at that time I still had not arrived at the point of opposition to this school which would have made the opposition thoroughgoing and one of principle.⁶²

With this second edition, Ritschl did take a diverse position from that of Tübingen, and throughout the rest of his life he sought to make good and to document this divergent position. Ritschl's "revolution" was thoroughgoing, and touched on almost all aspects of the theological enterprise of his time. This was in no small part due to the fact that Ritschl himself was concerned with historical, exegetical, and systematic problems, and did significant work in each.

Ritschl helped to clear away many difficulties by his limiting of theology to the point of view of faith in the God of Jesus Christ, and by his recognition that affirmations about God, sin, Christ, *et al.*, are meaningful only in a Christian context. He put his finger on the weakness of solely intellectual approaches, he helped "to clear up the discrepancies between religious and non-religious views of the same event,"⁶³ he "gave impetus to the historical examination of Christian faith,"⁶⁴ and of the life and faith of the historical Jesus, and he strengthened the emerging social gospel.⁶⁵ Yet, after insisting on the centrality of the Church, and criticizing the traditional theological method which worked from natural theology to revelation as invalid, he too proceeded "to analyze God's nature simply from the point of view of a member of the human community confronting nature."⁶⁶ That his point of view was that of a scientific, historical-positivist, nineteenth century enlightened man may have justified it to him as

standing outside the relativities that impinge on and generally corrupt all systems; it did not justify the point of view to a later disenchanted generation, nor to the orthodox confessionalist and hard-headed Lutherans of Dorpat-Erlangen. His "new mediating theology,"⁶⁷ based on a positivist-historical rather than a speculative-pietist ground, was rejected by the orthodox confessionalists, in spite of its foundation in biblical revelation.

We have already indicated that even as late as the Giessen years Harnack clung to the hope that some *rapprochement* could be effected between the rival camps.⁶⁸ Ritschl had scorned the idea, and by the time Harnack had lived through the strife over his appointment to the University of Berlin and the *Apostolikumsstreit* that followed, he was ready to agree with Ritschl. This agreement is intimated in a significant review-article of a book on Ritschl and his school; the book, written by Gustav Ecke, was reviewed by Harnack in *Christliche Welt* in 1897. In the review, Harnack declares that in order to understand Ritschl, three things must be set forth: (1) the fact that Ritschl was concerned to develop a unified theology; (2) the fact that Ritschl was interested in the historical, rather than in natural theology; and (3) the fact that Ritschl was always seeking to defend and strengthen the Protestant position:

What a noble purpose, and what idealism! The mighty faith in the possibility of achieving a strong, unified knowledge of God and the world! The renunciation of philosophy in favor of history! The conviction that the Reformation of the sixteenth century had won a positive, impregnable possession to enrich religion and thought, which needed only to be purely developed in order to drive back Catholicism and forever adjudge it wrong! Ritschl lived within these structures of thought, they were his objective, and every noble or acid word is to be understood from this point of view. Where among us is there still existent the complete certainty which this great theologian possessed?⁶⁹

Harnack describes Ritschl's "unified theology" as achieving the following: it made possible the scientific treatment of *Glaubenslehre*, it successfully overcame speculative rationalism, and it presented valid criticisms to an unsound piety. This achievement was effected by centering upon the greatness of Jesus Christ, the forgiveness of sins, and the necessity of using the Christian community as *Ausgangspunkt*.

But how could Ritschl affirm the centrality of Jesus Christ, and still insist that theological speculation as to Jesus' relation to God was pointless? Or, asked in a different way, what is the norm from which such a position could be set forth? The clue is to be found in his fundamental anthropocentrism, and this not in the sense that all formulations are man-made, and therefore relative, but in the sense that the norm is made to be *the value for man*. This norm is to be arrived at not by the employment of fundamentally biblical categories, in which

man is always seen to be under God, but by the employing of idealist speculation concerning man's relation to nature. Thus: "What is sought . . . is a solution of the contradiction in which man finds himself as both a part of nature and a spiritual personality claiming to dominate nature."⁷⁰ Or, again: "A religious value-judgment can be made only as one has experienced the way in which the particular religion makes available the power of God to secure man's dominion over the world of nature."⁷¹ God is thus made instrumental to the achievement of man's end, which is the actualization of his dominance over nature. To ask the question "What is God worth for man?" is an infinite methodological distance from asking "What is man worth under God?"

From this viewpoint, however, Ritschl proceeded to explicate his views; and all of the characteristic features of the Ritschlian theology are outgrowths of his insistence that apart from Christ we cannot know or grasp God as a redeeming Father,⁷² that "every claim to teach something concerning God in Himself apart from some real revelation on his part, felt and perceived on ours, is baseless,"⁷³ and that this essentially ethical revelation of historical Christianity is, indeed, the Word of God which is to be found in the Scripture. Ritschl's Christocentric method, his emphasis on Christian experience as against confession-alism, on the historical nature of Christianity as against speculative thought, and on the ethical and social in Christianity as against mysticism, all root in this fundamentally anthropocentric method.

Karl Barth has accused Ritschl of going behind romanticism and idealism to the fundamental tenets of the Enlightenment.⁷⁴ This charge is an oft-repeated one, and is used by Schweitzer in his description of the weakness of certain nineteenth century historical investigation, laboring as it did under the colossal presupposition of a "presuppositionless *Kulturprotestantismus*":

It is, indeed, not the least service of the eschatological school that it compels modern theology, which is so much preoccupied with history, to reveal what is its own as its own. Eschatology makes it impossible to attribute modern ideas to Jesus, and then by way of 'New Testament Theology' take them back from him as a loan, as even Ritschl not so long ago did with such naïveté. Johannes Weiss, in cutting himself loose, as a historian, from Ritschl, and recognizing that 'the real roots of Ritschl's ideas are to be found in Kant and the illuminist theology,' introduced the last decisive phase of the process of separation between historical and 'modern' theology.⁷⁵

This criticism requires evaluation, for if it is true that the clue to understanding Harnack lies in his axiology, and if he got this axiology primarily (not exclusively) from Ritschl, it must be asked whether it is indeed the Kantianism in Ritschl which prescribes the norm.

How far is it true to declare that "the real roots of Ritschl's ideas are to be found in Kant and the illuminist theology"? Ritschl, it is true, accepted the Kantian limitation of pure reason. With this limitation,

"the belief that has controlled theology, that the Christian conception of God and Christ must be demonstrated as a universal truth of reason, has been shaken to the foundation."⁷⁶ Thus far, Ritschl and Kant agree; but Ritschl welcomed this limitation, believing that it opened the possibility that Christian experience might be regarded as an independent source of truth. "Religion and theoretical knowledge are different functions of the spirit, which, when they deal with the same objects, are not even partially coincident, but are divergent throughout."⁷⁷ But this is to depart from the positive view of religion which Kant explicated, for, as Kattenbusch remarks, religion for Kant is practically "an annex to morals."⁷⁸ The practical reason which produces value-judgments deals *only* with moral judgments. Ritschl's religion, it is true, was also concerned with the ethical, but he surpassed the religion of Kant by his insistence that religion must be given an independent basis. For Ritschl, the *historical* was the starting-point, and he was the one who broke the pattern of imposing philosophical schemes on church history.⁷⁹ Individuals, not ideas or institutions alone, were to be centered upon; and he then went on to make his correlation between the historical (Jesus) and the ethical (love), in attempting to solve the dilemma of man in nature.

The basic value-judgment of all of Ritschl's thought is simply this: that man, though a part of the order of nature, has intrinsic worth over against nature by reason of his constitution as spirit. It is because Christianity solves this problem that it is to be regarded as the absolute religion. The problem itself, as has been suggested, was bequeathed to Ritschl and later to Harnack by the flourishing materialism of the time. How does Christianity solve this? "The revelation of God in Jesus, when responded to in active faith, gives man actual freedom and mastery over nature. It redeems him from sinfulness through the divine forgiveness, and implants in him that motive of love which aims at the moral organization of mankind."⁸⁰ This reconciliation with God takes place only within the Church. Because we possess this reconciliation, access to the kingdom of God, and a program for the mastery of life, we can say that we have God in Jesus Christ.

Ritschl has been accused of anthropocentrism, of rationalism, and of a culture-oriented Christianity. Too often, doubtless, he has been used as a straw-man, and interpreted in terms of later denatured varieties of Ritschlianism. It is true that for Ritschl moral faith is regulative. This norm was evolved, at least in part, as a reaction to Baur's Hegelianism, as Ritschl discovered the vast resources for theological work resident in the new "presuppositionless" historical method. But as he rejected the notion that "the idea works itself out in history," he sought, unsuccessfully, to take a stance which would bear no presup-

positions with regard to historical data; and, as in the case of his most famous disciple, the axiological presuppositions intruded. For Ritschl failed to take account of the fact that he too was an heir of German idealism, and in one of the fundamental categories of his thought (man over nature), he depended on the great idealist for the setting of the problem.⁸¹ Nature, man, and God, and the relations between these entities, were very much his fundamental concern. But further, he failed to take account of his own historical situation in his implied acceptance of the positivistic dictum that "the latest in time is the best in fact." This is evident in his optimistic appraisal of man, in his impatience with any mystical position which sought, at least, to point to an ultimate mystery that could not be plumbed, and, in patent form, in his confidence that the essence of the Gospel could be discovered by a historical method and applied by sensible men.

Harnack's evaluation of Ritschl's position as compared to that of orthodox Lutheran confessionalism has been suggested earlier. In a striking letter to Ritschl written in 1882, Harnack summarized the difference by specifying four points of contrast. In their theory of knowledge, the orthodox probe behind the historical facts; Ritschl stands upon historical events. As to method, they want *loci*; Ritschl desires a system. In dogmatics, the Augustinian concept of sin and the Anselmian reconciliation doctrine are decisive for the older theology; this is not true for Ritschl. Practically, they seek to master all knowledge, defining everything through an ecclesiastical *loci*-dogmatic; Ritschl abjures this and places the problem of the Christian on the ground of religious virtue.⁸² The orthodox, therefore, seek to write history with trans-historical objects intruding; the new theology remains conscious of the limits of history, though it holds a high view with respect to the efficacy of historical knowledge. The orthodox speak of Jesus and of the events concerning his life from the standpoint of a dogmatic position which emphasizes his relation to God; the new theology remains silent when it confronts mystery, and above all does not bring a dogmatic prepossession to this historical person. The orthodox confess that Jesus is the Christ, *a priori*; the new theology takes the position that "he has the value of God for us," which position is based on a historical examination. So Harnack believed. As we have stated, the differences between the old and the new theology proved to be unbridgeable; in part, this was due to the fact that the proponents could not understand each other. Harnack brooded anxiously over an exchange between Ritschl and Engelhardt, to no effect; Engelhardt confessed, almost with exasperation, "If I could only solve the riddle of that man!"⁸³ Harnack's naiveté was somewhat dissipated when pamphlets began to appear roundly condemning his own work as "destructive Ritschlianism," and Ritschl's

own books were burned by the zealots. Ritschl entertained no sanguine hopes about the possibility of a *rapprochement*, and passed on to his disciples the advice to "Trust in God, keep your powder dry, and write textbooks!"⁸⁴ And indeed, this was just the procedure which Harnack employed to make clear to himself and to others where he stood. In 1885 he published the first volume of his *Dogmengeschichte* and sent the first copy to Ritschl. Affirming his great debt to Ritschl, continuous since 1868 when he first read the *Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, he declares that "without the foundation which you laid, the *Dogmengeschichte* probably would never have been written."⁸⁵ The critiques, praises, and bombast which greeted this work made it clear that Harnack had staked out a position from which he would henceforth be judged. It should not be overlooked that this work marks the irrevocable separation-point for Harnack from his orthodox training, and was at the same time the occasion for the inevitable but painful break with his father. For a long time Theodosius Harnack remained silent, even asking his Dorpat colleagues not to speak to him about this work of his son. Finally he wrote:

Our difference is not a theological one, but deeper and directly Christian, so that if I overlook it I deny Christ, and that no one can require or expect of me, even if he stands as near to me as you, my son. Anyone—to take the most decisive concern—who takes the position that you take on the Resurrection-event . . . is in my eyes no longer a Christian theologian. I am quite unable to understand how, after such historical bungling anyone can call this history, or I understand it only if one thereby degrades Christianity . . . For me Christianity stands or falls on the Resurrection-event.⁸⁶

From this point on, Harnack was *persona non grata*, theologically speaking, in orthodox circles; all possibility of mediation was gone, and he became the storm-center of the liberalism of the time. What mediation there was to be, was carried on with a different referent in mind, viz., the culture.

"Historical Axiology"; Harnack's Norm

In an early letter to Wilhelm Stintzing,⁸⁷ Harnack made plain his awareness and understanding of the live options for the Christian theologian in the late nineteenth century. To recapitulate, he saw himself as required to do three things: "to understand Christianity historically and to set it in living relation to all historical events, to work beyond the dogmatic . . . to the inner form of Christian truth, and to confess and defend . . . the independently won position in all sincerity." We contend that these statements constitute a valid summary of Harnack's life-long purpose and position. We believe further that a careful assessment of his background and environment makes obvious the sources from which this position was derived, and the setting with respect to which it was employed. Finally, we believe that "historical

axiology" is the best descriptive term to which these principles can be reduced. It is desirable that these contentions be dealt with in a summary statement.

We have seen that nineteenth century Germany, rich though it was in systems, exacted a high mortality on these systems. At the beginning of the century, Kant had made possible several new approaches for theology, but his own interpretation of religion was meager. Romanticism, a spirit more than a movement, brooded over the century like a benign presence, occasionally striking a solitary soul with its pagan fire. Schleiermacher's effort, never completely overcome, was rendered less effectual within the Church by neo-confessional and neo-supernatural revivals. Hegel's school collapsed with the dissolution of his metaphysic, and the displacement of the notion of an absolute rational religion by the recognition of the concrete historical character of Christianity. Baur at Tübingen exerted a powerful influence through the historical-critical approach, but joined it with Hegelian philosophical presuppositions; with the collapse of Hegelian idealism, Baur went into eclipse. Eighteenth century supernaturalism, torn by inner conflict, rendered ineffectual by rationalism, by-passed by the multiform historical-critical evolutionary thought, could still revive sufficiently, as at Dorpat and Erlangen, to reclaim temporarily some of its lost domain. Ritschl accepted Kant's reduction, but rejected his interpretation of religion as mere morality, seeking an independent basis for religion in moral faith. Mechanistic materialism was challenging any religious interpretation of human life, and seducing thousands from the churches. And pietistic-biblical supernaturalism was in control in these churches, flavored on occasion with cultural influences, but in the main avoiding scientific questions, or leaving them to ethnologists, philologists, and philosophers. This was the situation within which Adolf Harnack did his work.

The significance of this situation for an understanding of Harnack is clear when we remember four things: (1) that Harnack was a son of Dorpat-Erlangen orthodoxy; (2) that he had been strongly influenced by Tübingen historical criticism; (3) that he was thoroughly conversant with all of the cultural components just set forth; and (4) that the position he came to adopt had as its self-conscious purpose an attempted mediation. This attempt at a mediation between the old and the new theology within the Church was transmuted, in the course of Harnack's development, into an attempt to mediate between the Church and culture. It attempted to utilize the historical-critical approach, and was rigorously faithful to the "scientific" canons thereof. Though Ritschl, in certain distinctive ways Harnack's "enlightener," had restricted his vocation to theology, Harnack moved on a larger stage. To

describe the sequence of development by which this ultimate result came about, we must go back to the crucial Leipzig period. Harnack confessed that he was glad to leave Dorpat, for the theology here was of a single variety, and any expression of doubt brought the charge of insincerity. Harnack had doubts a-plenty, as his voluminous correspondence shows, and he was unable to repress them lest he become hypocritical. *Sicherheit* and *Einheit*, key clues to his entire life, are frequent words in his early letters.

Having completed his doctoral work at Leipzig, he prepared a *Habilitationsschrift* defending this proposition: "There is no other method for the exegesis of Holy Scripture than the grammatical-historical."⁸⁸ Until 1879, when he accepted a call to Giessen, he was implementing this text. There were four main problems for which he sought answers in the Leipzig period, and these can almost be taken as paradigmatic for his entire life. First, he was concerned with the problem of historical method, which for him was answered by the word science. He was always concerned with the discovery of new manuscripts, with improved editions, textual purity, and chronological accuracy. Secondly, he sought to deal with the problem of understanding church history properly and representing it fairly; this could be done if church history was viewed as a part of the total spiritual history of mankind, to be assessed by historical means and methods, and if it were at the same time recognized that God's hidden but present revelation to man was contained therein. Thirdly, the problem of the representation of the rise and development of Christian dogma provided the particular special focus of interest. Finally, the problem of organizing the developing new science so as to make it yield its full potential demanded a practical solution. The latter question was in part answered by the founding, with Schürer, of the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, which became the organ of the Ritschlian school.⁸⁹

The three questions have been stated in a slightly different way here, but the essential direction is the same, and answers are clearly set forth. "To understand Christianity historically" meant for Harnack scientific method; "to set it in living relation to all historical event" would be achieved by this method; "to work beyond the dogmatic . . . to the inner form" meant (1) to *know* the history of dogma, and (2) to recognize that within the husks of this "spiritual history" was hidden God's revelation to man; "to confess and defend . . . the independently won position" required the organization of church history so as to make it yield its full potential.

It is clear that in this statement *history* and *value* are both emphasized. The former is so obvious as to need no underlining; the latter is to be seen in such phrases as "total spiritual history," "this is God's

revelation to man," and "full potential." We would argue that these phrases show, respectively, the influence of (1) romanticism and Hegelianism, (2) Dorpat-Erlangen and Ritschl, and (3) romanticism and mechanistic materialism. We refuse to admit that this is a strained exegesis of Harnack's phrases. Indeed, Harnack's universal concern, making necessary as it does a full evaluation of the many currents already discussed in this article, is precisely the controlling emphasis of the interpretation we are setting forth. We submit that it is those interpreters who fall prey to the "fallacy of simple location" who do the real violence to Harnack. Few men in the history of theology have borne within themselves the multiform heritage which Harnack enjoyed; and few have been as concerned to do justice to all facets of a heritage. Harnack's daughter has communicated this concern for completeness on her father's part in a significant comment about him during the Leipzig years. It was customary of course, for young theologians to take some position which would be identified and then defended. But Harnack took no such position: "His critics were not certain in which camp he belonged—for that anyone could belong to *no* camp was unheard of."⁹⁰ Harnack was always interested in synthesizing variant views, thus trying to take what was true out of each position he encountered. In short, if one wishes to describe Harnack's "position," one must include in such a description at least the six streams of thought to which we have referred in this chapter. The influences bear various weights; some are positive influences (romanticism, Kant, Ritschl), one is certainly negative (mechanistic materialism), and some are ambivalent (Dorpat-Erlangen, Tübingen). But to omit any of these completely is to fail to interpret the influences shaping Harnack.

Harnack's "universality," characterizing the post-Leipzig period, was achieved only after he had encountered severe criticism of his early work. When his Leipzig publications began to appear, and the reviews of the many theological faculties of nineteenth century Germany followed, one in particular disturbed Harnack. This was the critique of his work by Overbeck, to which we have already referred.⁹¹ Overbeck charged Harnack, along with the "believing theologians," with "risking nothing."⁹² Harnack, in a letter to Engelhardt, admitted "with shame" that Overbeck was right.⁹³ He had been a son of Dorpat-Erlangen; he had been influenced by Tübingen; and he had believed that the orthodox theology could be reconciled with the new historical criticism. On the basis of Overbeck's criticism, he squarely faced this question, and passionately declared to Engelhardt that he could find no way between the "mummified dogmatic" of the "believing theologians" and the *Tendenzkritik* of Baur and his school.⁹⁴ Admitting the attraction of the latter, which had had a glorious dawn but no following

sunrise, dissatisfied with the heritage which would not come to terms with the burning questions posed by Baur, he resolved the conflict, sometime during the Leipzig years, in favor of neither. It was Ritschl who opened a way of mediation; in Ritschl, Harnack declared, "lies the future direction of Protestantism."⁹⁵

What did Ritschl contribute to Harnack, and are there significant points of deviation? It was Ritschl who raised real questions in Harnack's mind as to the legitimacy of the Tübingen interpretation. Harnack followed Ritschl in abjuring metaphysical speculation; Ritschl, as we have seen, "emancipated" Harnack from his uneasy tension between Dorpat-Erlangen and Tübingen; Ritschl communicated his passionate concern for the historical to Harnack; Ritschl stood as an ardent defender of Protestantism; Ritschl tried to defend Christianity against the growing threat of mechanistic materialism; Ritschl centered on the problem of value, and interpreted Christianity in terms of moral faith. In his essay on "The Present Position of Protestantism," Harnack uses terms nearly identical with those of Ritschl in defining "religion": "Religion is only a steadfast temper of the soul, rooted in child-like trust in God."⁹⁶ This trust "is inescapably bound up with plain, simple rule that the moral life, in all its solemnity and earnestness, is the correlative of Religion, and that without it Religion becomes idolatry."⁹⁷ Harnack then ascribes the achievement and re-affirmation of this Reformation understanding of Christianity to Ritschl. This is, indeed, according to Harnack, modern Protestantism's debt to Ritschl, that "he grasped the fundamental ideas of the Gospel and of the Reformation with insight and vigour,"⁹⁸ and separated them from those extraneous entanglements and fetters with which they had been bound up. Thus far, Harnack was indebted to Ritschl, and so deeply were these influences inculcated that it cannot be doubted that Ritschl is the *main* contributor to him.

However, in the last phase of Harnack's life—from *Das Wesen des Christentums* on—there are signs of some deviation from Ritschl. Though there is the continued emphasis on historical-critical endeavor, as signified by the publication of Harnack's great work on Marcion in 1921, and though the full-blown axiological norm to which Ritschl had contributed significantly is still apparent, Hegelian strains are more pronounced. The final "stages" of scientific knowledge—those stressing the individual and spiritual aspects—are colored with Hegelianism, as seen in the essay "Über die Sicherheit und die Grenzen geschichtlicher Erkenntnis."⁹⁹

Yet the truth is still in the mean here, for in the development of these "stages" of knowledge, it is the Ritschlian category of worth that dominates. In his fundamental assertion that the historian must

assess that which is of moral worth in the work of a man, he is clearly depending on Ritschl. It is this latter tenet of the position held by Ritschl and Harnack that made them vulnerable to the charge of apriorism; for to determine "moral worth" a stance must be assumed, and it is clear (*pace* Harnack) that such a stance was present. This stance was apologetic: he would, he *must*, speak to culture. He would, as a mediator, redeem for the Church those masses who could no longer accept the Gospel as the churches preached it. One cannot but confess sympathy with Harnack at this point when the effusions of certain of the high brow fundamentalists of his time are recalled. His heritage made it imperative that atheistic materialism be rejected. But his passion was to try to make his contemporaries see that these two—atheism or fundamentalism—were not the only options. There could and must be a *via media*. This middle way must on the one hand be intellectually and scientifically respectable, to speak to the cultured; it must also take full account of the uniqueness of Jesus, to speak to the Church. Harnack believed he had found such a middle way in Ritschlian liberalism. History, which had come into its own as a science, had made possible for men the recovery of the historical power of the essential in Jesus, his Gospel; but this history as Harnack conceived it thereby incorporated within itself a full-bodied doctrine of humanity. History could tell us about Jesus and his power, his purpose, and his influence in history. Thus could man overcome his past and lay the foundations of the future.

Where is the "tragic flaw" in this fundamental stance? It lies, we believe, in the real decision to regard the world and the overcoming of that which one finds in the world as the primary referent. What difference would it have made if, instead of attempting to answer via history the question "How can one grasp the inner form of Christianity, and defend it?", Harnack had asked the question "How can I be faithful to God, whether I see the immediate relevance of this fidelity or not?" This former question suggests the extent to which Harnack remained under the influence of the romanticism in his background, with its passion to "know all," to "experience all"; and it also has as its clear objective to "defend Christianity" to the culture. Our judgment is that Harnack was pre-eminently influenced by this latter objective, so that it is true that his fundamental referent was the culture, and his purpose to find meaning for the embattled soul within this culture.

How does one summarize the background and the environmental influences on Harnack? Mechanistic materialism and "mummified orthodoxy" provided the challenge. Romanticism dictated the *nisus* to essence procedure. The Dorpat-Erlangen, Tübingen, Ritschlian background prescribed the historical method of procedure, which in the last

phase reasserted certain Hegelian themes. But the *content* of the essence, once identified, was *Ritschlian axiology* with a nimbus.

1. Agnes von Zahn-Harnack, *Adolf von Harnack* (Berlin: Hans Bott, 1936), pp. 28-32. Hereafter all references to this work will be designated AZH.
2. *Op. cit.*, p. 48.
3. Von Oettingen "could recite *Faust* from beginning to end from memory." AZH, p. 48.
4. *Op. cit.*, pp. 93-94.
5. *Ibid.*
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Op. cit.*, p. 95.
8. *Op. cit.*, p. 96.
9. *Op. cit.*, p. 98.
10. *Op. cit.*, pp. 56-64.
11. Particularly through the founding, with Schürer, of the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*.
12. AZH, p. 108.
13. *Op. cit.*, p. 325.
14. As he said of Luther, it could be said of him, "Never did he think to fight against the Church, but always for the Church against a false and soul-dangerous practice; never did he dream that the Gospel had been really lost—no, but it was to be freed from a captivity into which...the theologians had led it." Quoted from Lyman Abbott et al., *The Prophets of Christian Faith* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1896), p. 115. Harnack's essay in this volume is entitled "Martin Luther, The Prophet of the Reformation."
15. Cf. AZH, p. 146.
16. *Op. cit.*, p. 171.
17. Cf. *infra*, pp. 163ff. for the opponents of Christianity" whom Harnack undoubtedly had in mind.
18. AZH, pp. 196-201.
19. *Op. cit.*, p. 201.
20. *Op. cit.*, p. 202.
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Op. cit.*, p. 203.
23. Harnack received at this time his second call to Harvard. AZH, p. 210.
24. However, as a concession to orthodoxy, Adolf Schlatter, a conservative, was appointed to the Berlin faculty. AZH, pp. 208-09.
25. *Op. cit.*, p. 212.
26. Harnack, *What Is Christianity?* trans. Thomas Bailey Saunders (4th ed. rev.; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1923), p. 125.
27. AZH, pp. 295f.
28. *Op. cit.*, p. 300.
29. *Op. cit.*, pp. 39f.
30. Harnack, *Christianity and History*, trans. Thomas Bailey Saunders (London: A. and C. Black, 1896), p. 30.
31. Harnack, "Über das Verhältnis der Kirchengeschichte zur Universalgeschichte," *Eeden und Aufsätze*, Band II, Neue Folge: *Aus Wissenschaft und Leben* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1911) 57. Hereafter items in this series will be designated RA, with the appropriate volume number, NF in the case of the new series, and the title of the volume if any.
32. Harnack, "Das doppelte Evangelium im Neuen Testament," RA, II, NF: *Aus Wissenschaft und Leben*, 211-24.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 222-23.
34. *Ibid.*
35. *Ibid.*
36. AZH, p. 516.
37. Quoted with no source given in H. R. Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology: Schleiermacher to Barth* (London: Nisbet and Company, 1937), p. 160.
38. Cf. Harnack, "Das doppelte Evangelium im Neuen Testament," RA, II, NF: *Aus Wissenschaft und Leben*, for Harnack's development of this identification.
39. Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 223-24.
40. Harnack, *What Is Christianity?* pp. 45-55.
41. Cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 63-64.
42. Ernst Troeltsch, "The Dogmatics of the Religionsgeschichtliche Schule," *American Journal of Theology*, XVII (January, 1913), 12.
43. AZH, p. 90.
44. *Ibid.*
45. Cf. the critique of liberalism by H. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), pp. 15-19.
46. Ernst Troeltsch, "Adolf v. Harnack und Ferd. Christian v. Baur," *Festgabe zu Harnacks 70. Geburtstag*, p. 282. I was unable to secure this work except on microfilm from the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin. No publication date was given on the microfilm.
47. *Ibid.*
48. *Ibid.*
49. *Op. cit.*, p. 283.
50. Troeltsch, "The Dogmatics....," p. 9.
51. Cf. Karl Barth, *Die protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert. Ihre Vorgeschichte und ihre Geschichte* (Zweite Auflage, verbesserte; Zürich: Zollikon, 1952), p. 487 for an assessment of Feuerbach's influence in this respect.
52. Karl Löwith's "L'achèvement de la philosophie classique par Hegel et sa dissolution chez Marx et Kierkegaard."

- ard," *Recherches Philosophiques*, IV (1934-1935), 232-67, is a suggestive essay which points out that Hegel departed from his own early declared principle, "Fini absolu contre infini absolu," in his achieved system. Kierkegaard held that Hegel's "existence" was, therefore, always abstract and ideal rather than real.
53. Barth, in *Die protestantische Theologie*, p. 453, declares that such a history of dogma as that of Harnack, basing everything on the Gospel of Jesus, would have been regarded by Baur as hopeless; for it rested essentially on a pragmatism by means of which the riches of history could never be possessed.
 54. Cf. also Emanuel Hirsch, *Geschichte der neuern evangelischen Theologie in Zusammenhang mit den allgemeinen Bewegungen des europäischen Denkens* (Fünf Bände; Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann Verlag, 1950) V, 625.
 55. Harnack, "The Present State of Research in Early Church History," *EA*, II (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1904), 217-35.
 56. *Op. cit.*, p. 222.
 57. Harnack, *Christianity and History*, p. 25.
 58. Hirsch, *Geschichte*, IV, 446.
 59. *Ibid.*
 60. Ernst Troeltsch, *Gesammelte Schriften*, Band III: *Der Historismus und seine Probleme* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1922), p. 529.
 61. "Herder's significance for subsequent theology is seldom estimated highly enough. Without Herder no Schleiermacher and no de Wette. Without Herder the specific pathos of the theological history of the nineteenth century would be impossible. Without Herder no Erlangen School and no history of religions school. Without Herder no Troeltsch also." Barth, *Die protestantische Theologie*, p. 282.
 62. Albrecht Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche* (Zweite Auflage, ausgearbeitete; Bonn: Marcus, 1857), p. v.
 63. H. Richard Niebuhr, *The Meaning of Revelation* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941), p. 26.
 64. *Ibid.*
 65. *Ibid.*
 66. *Op. cit.*, p. 29.
 67. Hirsch, *Geschichte*, V, 558.
 68. *Supra*, p. 159.
 69. Harnack, "Ritschl und seine Schule," *EA*, II, 355.
 70. Quoted in Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology*, p. 150.
 71. Robert Koenig, "The Use of the Bible in Albrecht Ritschl's Theology and the Significance of His Method for Today" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Divinity School, The University of Chicago, 1953), p. 30.
 72. Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology*, p. 145.
 73. *Ibid.*
 74. *Op. cit.*, p. 141.
 75. Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of Its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*, trans. W. Montgomery (London: A. and C. Black, 1911), p. 141.
 76. Eugene W. Lyman, "Ritschl's Theory of Value-Judgments," *Journal of Religion*, V (October, 1925), 505.
 77. *Ibid.*
 78. Ferdinand Kattenbusch, *Die deutsche evangelische Theologie seit Schleiermacher: ihre Leistungen und ihre Schäden* (Vierte Auflage, umgearbeitete; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1924), p. 51.
 79. *Ibid.*
 80. Lyman, "Ritschl's Theory," p. 508.
 81. Although, of course, he rejected this solution.
 82. AZH, pp. 127-28.
 83. *Ibid.*
 84. *Op. cit.*, p. 129.
 85. *Op. cit.*, p. 135.
 86. *Op. cit.*, p. 143.
 87. *Op. cit.*, pp. 39f.
 88. *Op. cit.*, p. 69.
 89. *Op. cit.*, pp. 81-85.
 90. *Op. cit.*, p. 87.
 91. *Supra*, pp. 165-66.
 92. *Supra*, p. 166.
 93. AZH, p. 90.
 94. *Op. cit.*, p. 91.
 95. *Ibid.*
 96. Harnack, *Thoughts on the Present Position of Protestantism*, trans. Thomas Bailey Saunders (London: A. and C. Black, 1899), p. 54.
 97. *Ibid.*
 98. *Op. cit.*, p. 56.
 99. Harnack, "Über die Sicherheit," *EA*, IV, NF: *Erforschtes und Erlebtes, passim*.

THE SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY OF JOSIAH STRONG: SOCIAL CHRISTIANITY AND AMERICAN PROGRESSIVISM

DOROTHEA R. MULLER, *C. W. Post College, Long Island*

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries progressivism and social Christianity were two answers to the need of that day for social action and reform. A study of the social philosophy of Josiah Strong, a leader in the movement for applied Christianity, provides an interesting illustration of the harmony of the social ideas of these two movements.

Josiah Strong, perhaps most known to-day for the influence of his writings in rationalizing imperialism, as deduced from his book *Our Country*, was recognized by his contemporaries as a pioneer in the movement for applied Christianity and social reform. His many interests during the years from 1885 to 1916 as clergyman, reformer, organizer and prophet of the twentieth-century city, as well as his zeal and warm personality, made him an associate and friend of reformers in all fields—religious, social, political and economic. Among his personal friends were Washington Gladden, Walter Rauschenbusch, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Richard T. Ely, Robert A. Woods and Theodore Roosevelt. Graham Taylor wrote that in the early days of his work he had gone to Josiah Strong “to gather inspiration and guidance for institutional church evangelism.” Walter Rauschenbusch paid tribute to Strong for having “matured” his thought when Rauschenbusch and other social-gospel ministers were young men and for having “a spirit” which “kindled and compelled” them.¹ On the occasion of memorial services for Strong in May, 1916, many other leaders acknowledged the influence upon them of Strong’s message. Edward A. Ross wrote, “I doubt if one could name four men of our time who have so stamped their thought upon the religious people of this country. He saw the goal clearer than anybody else and he had the inspiration to make people press toward it.” Robert A. Woods stated, “His career has been remarkable in its steady consecutive continuity and cumulative power. The influence that has come out of his teaching and example is one of the important assets of our national life.” Washington Gladden regretted that he could not be present at the memorial services “to confess the debt I owe to him for the clearing of my own vision, the deepening of my conviction, and the confirmation of my purpose.” Walter Rauschenbusch stated, “I truly think there are not many men who are so wholly deserving of honor as Josiah Strong . . . his addresses and books have been among the most constructive influences of our Christian life.” The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America

paid tribute to Strong as "one of the pioneer founders" of the Federal Council and as "one of the great seers of his day and generation" whose influence "eternity alone can adequately measure."²

Strong's work as a Congregational minister began as a missionary on the frontier in Cheyenne, Wyoming from 1871 to 1873. It was the experience of striving to bring religion to this "hell on wheels," as he called Cheyenne, that convinced him of the need for a social gospel. Pastorates in the 1880's in industrial Sandusky and Cincinnati resulted in his preaching a social gospel in these cities. Comments by his parishioners in Sandusky make clear that they recognized that he was preaching a new social message. His awareness of the vital importance of the city movement for both the church and the nation resulted in his calling in 1885 of the first interdenominational church conference devoted specifically to the problems of the city. Achieving national recognition the next year as a result of his challenging little book *Our Country: Its Possible Future And Its Present Crisis*, which appeared in January, 1886, Strong was called to be General Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance for the United States. Because his increasing emphasis on a social doctrine and social services for the church was not supported by the members of the executive committee of the Alliance, Strong's programs were thwarted, forcing him to resign in 1898 after twelve years of service, at the age of fifty-one.³ He immediately established his own organization, the League for Social Service. From 1898 until his death in 1916, he sought to use the League as a means of awakening the church and the nation to their social obligations as well as a means of explaining the social message of Jesus.

As Strong developed his religious views in a steady stream of sermons, addresses, articles and books, he wove into his discussions an explanation of the nature of society, of social problems and of social reforms. Josiah Strong's social philosophy was a vital part of his social Christianity. It was a synthesis of his social interpretation of Christianity and the scientific evolutionary philosophy of his day. It was for the most part typical of the social philosophy held by advocates of the social gospel. He expressed his views of society in religious terms in his discussions of the immanence of God, the unity of the sacred and the secular, the perfectibility of man and the possible realization of the religious and social ideal of the kingdom of God on earth. He expressed his views of society in scientific terms in his discussions of society as an organism, of social interdependence and of evolutionary change and guided progress. While the social philosophy presented in Strong's writings was typical of that found in the works of such advocates of social Christianity as Washington Gladden, Graham Taylor, Lyman Abbott, Richard T. Ely and Walter Rauschenbusch, Strong's

discussions were distinctive in his repeated emphasis on the laws of love, service and sacrifice, in his awareness of the boundless significance of science for the new civilization and in his early application of the social-gospel philosophy to a world sphere.

The religious and social philosophy of Josiah Strong clearly illustrates the great similarity between the social thought of applied Christianity and that of American progressivism. The basic social concepts emphasized by Strong as well as by progressivism were, namely, a great appreciation—almost reverence—for the method and discoveries of science, the social use of the theory of evolution, an emphasis on an organic view of society with its corollaries of interdependence and social duties, a recognition of the importance of environment, a belief in the possibility of continued progress culminating in a near-perfected man and society, and an attitude of crisis, of the urgent need for immediate reforms. It is also significant that the problems on which Strong focused his attention as well as the methods he advocated and employed to meet these problems were those typical of the Progressive movement. The city problem, political corruption, conditions of labor, concentration of wealth, world responsibilities were his primary concern. The establishment of an agency to collect, publish and distribute sociological data, the organization of reform groups for the effective expression of an aroused public opinion, the adoption of the initiative, referendum and recall, these methods were also those on which Strong centered his attention and efforts. Strong's adherence to progressivism's faith in education was expressed in his often repeated statement that "the generic reform is the education of public opinion"; and this was one of the primary functions of his League for Social Service.

The methods and discoveries of science were accepted and followed with great enthusiasm by reformers of the progressive era. So too, Strong and other advocates of the social gospel greatly respected the ideas and findings of "the new science." To Strong, there was no warfare between science and religion. On the contrary, he believed that one was the perfect supplement of the other. "The truths of science," he wrote, "are God's truths . . . its laws are God's laws." In his opinion, the discoveries and principles of science were a continual revelation from God of God's purposes and methods, "as truly a revelation from God and of God as are the Scriptures."⁴ Thus, this progressive revelation of God through science meant that theology, itself, would grow. With the application of the scientific method to the interpretation of the scriptures and to the study of nature, the Divine Aim (the idea of the Kingdom on earth) and the Divine Method (the evolutionary process) were brought to light. In Strong's opinion, science, as a revelation from God, was to play as real a part in the coming of the kingdom

among men as the New Testament. Science, he wrote, enabled man "to become a co-laborer with him [God], an assistant creator, in perfecting humanity and its dwelling place," that is, he added, when man's heart has been enlarged with love.⁵

Strong urged the church to recognize the divine nature of science and the scientific method and, thus, make its methods scientific because God's methods were scientific. He argued that institutional churches should be established because they were scientific in recognizing man's physical as well as spiritual nature. Strong's awareness of the consequences of science was such that he foresaw an ever-increasing tendency toward city life as scientific knowledge and machinery were applied to agriculture and when food as well as wool and cotton were produced from chemicals. He also believed that a world-life had been made a possibility, as well as a necessity, by the new methods of communication and transportation. Such enthusiastic statements concerning science frequently appeared in social-gospel writings. Washington Gladden wrote in 1899 that "the scientific spirit" was "the spirit of reverence" and that Jesus' teachings, especially the Second Commandment, had been "scientifically verified" by the well established facts of modern science. Strong saw in the social-gospel philosophy a means of harmonizing science and theology and went so far as to plan a volume devoted to showing that the principles of science confirmed the social teachings of Jesus and assisted in the application of these teachings to existing social conditions.⁶

The theory of evolution with its concepts of continuous change, adaptation, development and growth was interpreted by progressives as a promise of unlimited progress. So, too, advocates of the social gospel believed that the theory of evolution supported their faith in progress toward the realization of the perfect society, the kingdom of God on earth. Unlike other social-gospel leaders, particularly Washington Gladden and Lyman Abbott, who wrote essays and books with the specific purpose of convincing readers of the harmony of evolution and Christian doctrines, Strong was not interested in presenting his readers with arguments for the acceptance of the theory. He proceeded on the assumption that those who were not scientific experts must accept the conclusions which the majority of scientists accepted and, thus, he simply wove the concepts of evolution into his arguments for an applied Christianity.

The idea of development had significant influence on many of the orthodox religious doctrines originally held by members of the social-gospel group. Many social-gospel advocates placed emphasis on gradual "Christian nurture" as opposed to spontaneous regeneration, on the social nature of sin, on the realization of the kingdom on earth. In gen-

eral, however, they sought to avoid any concern with the problems of theology or with the formulation of any creed. In the early days of the movement, Strong urged that efforts to emphasize the social mission of the church not "be dragged into the theological arena." Any theological war related to this movement for applied Christianity, he believed, would be fatal. The idea of the kingdom on earth undoubtedly had its theological implications, he wrote, "for all truth seems to be related to all other truth," but he pleaded that the concept should not be thrust forward, but left to suggest itself gradually. Instead of fighting theological views inconsistent with the concept, the vital truths of the social mission of the church should be implanted and, he concluded, "their growth will uproot the convictions that stand in their way." Strong, as well as others in the movement, often quoted the text: "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine." (John 7:17) Strong wrote that his religion was true because it "worked" for him. And Gladden stated that his "theology had to be hammered out on the anvil for daily use in the pulpit."⁷ It is interesting that neither Strong nor Gladden studied systematic theology.

Not only did this "new evangel of science" reveal evolution as the method of creation and change, but it also revealed a universal reign of law in both nature and society. Strong urged the application of the scientific method to all fields of study in order to discover laws which if obeyed would bring harmony to society. Natural laws existed, he concluded, with respect to the birth rate, population movements, pauperism, crime and even amusements. He believed that the key to the very meaning of all life was God's desire for "men to live in perfect harmony with all the laws of their being." Strong, Gladden and other social-gospel leaders wrote of the discovery and obedience to the laws of nature, as well as of individual and social life, as the means by which society could actualize its highest possibilities, eventually reaching its social ideal of the kingdom. The very purpose of the new ethical school of economists, wrote Richard T. Ely, was "to ascertain the laws of progress, and to show men how to make use of them."⁸ Social Christianity and progressivism called for a "science of society." Strong expressed the belief that the study of society and its laws was necessary so that "the good" might become "the wise." In 1894 he was elected the second president of the American Institute of Christian Sociology.

Social-gospel thinkers saw the existence of natural law as an expression of God's benevolent will and as an affirmation of a God who was immanent in nature and active in human affairs. Natural law, as Strong wrote, confirmed the idea of a God who was "purposing, guiding, overruling, accomplishing."⁹ Thus, the new study of Christ and the rediscovery of His social teachings were not mere chance, but were "the

timing of Providence" so that the evolving new era might "indeed be the fuller coming of the Kingdom." The social concepts of applied Christianity were firmly rooted in the doctrine of immanence. A doctrine which stressed the unity of the sacred and the secular meant that man's physical and spiritual needs were closely related, that the worldly and spiritual ideals of the perfect society were closely related. While for some the idea of an immanent God was concluded from the idea of evolution, for Strong belief in immanence, he wrote, resulted from a personal need for a sense of unity in life. Although Strong, as well as others, emphasized the concept of immanence as a cardinal one, they warned that the concept of God's transcendence over nature and man was needed to supplement it. God was "not only in all and through all, [but] . . . also over all," stated Gladden. Strong firmly declared that the social gospel did "not propose to make a religion out of man's obligations to his fellows, to put love for man in place of love to God."¹⁰ It was this much needed balance between immanence and transcendence which later social-gospel advocates ignored.

The optimism of the social thought of the progressive era was partly the result of progressivism's faith in progress, faith in science's promise of unlimited, indefinite progress. The social gospel also found confirmation for its central doctrine of the kingdom on earth in the idea of progress. The kingdom idea inspired the enthusiasm and drive so evident in the writings and activities of social-gospel men. Strong defined the kingdom on earth as a world-wide society in which "all human life, physical, intellectual, moral, spiritual, social, industrial and political, would be brought into harmony with the will of God."¹¹ Strong clearly made the preaching and the realization of this ideal the underlying purpose and end of all his writing, of all his activity for reform, of all his concern for evangelizing the American West, the twentieth-century city and the world. He was one of the few to stress that the idea of the kingdom was not a fixed and absolute one. He stated that it could not be considered a religious version of some specific political or economic program. The concept must vary in different eras and with different individuals. But, he explained, so far as man became like Jesus, man's conception of the ideal world would approximate that of Jesus.

Strong's faith in the eventual realization of the kingdom on earth was based partly on his Biblical studies which, he believed, revealed the kingdom to have been the central idea of Jesus' teaching. The possibility of realizing this ideal also happily found confirmation, he stressed, in man's ability to discover the laws of nature and society. God's will would be done on earth, he wrote, when love brought perfect human life and when obedience to the natural laws discovered by science brought perfect conditions. In so far as science gave man the knowledge

of exact laws, it gave man the gift of prophecy, the ability in large measure to shape the future of the race. With the discovery of the laws of nature and society and their application to life vast changes would be made in the material world as well as in the world of ideas, theology included. Man had nothing to fear from change, itself, he assured his readers, for no change was "beyond God's knowledge or the scope of his plan or the wide reach of his power." He agreed with Graham Taylor that change was the inexorable law of all life, to which the spiritual life is no exception. In ages past, Strong asserted, good men were disturbed by changes which challenged their long established beliefs, but now "we are enabled to see that those changes were but the revolutions of God's great chariot-wheels, bearing the world onward toward the goal of his beneficent purposes."¹² Strong seems to come perilously close here to identifying change, itself, with progress. Thus, he wrote that progress had "its perils" as it always had, but that "now, as always," safety was to be found "in more progress." He concluded that "the backward look never sees the way out; for God's golden age is in the future." All true progress was, indeed, "nothing more or less than the discovery of God's laws and their application to life." He referred to the law of progress as meaning an ever-nearing of perfection, for, he stated, "if we may not reach absolute perfection the law of progress is a promise that we may always more and more closely approximate it. Jesus . . . did not hesitate to hold up the standard of absolute perfection. He said, 'Be ye, therefore, perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.'"¹³ Strong's optimistic faith in the possibility—and almost inevitability—of indefinite progress was not, however, a sentimental belief in automatic progress. He emphasized that man might modify, help or hinder the progress of civilization through man's control or lack of control of change because of man's own ignorance and sin. Progress was possible, but not automatic. Future progress depended upon man's moral effort and intelligent guidance of the institutions of society. In previous ages, humanity had been forced upward by circumstances in an unconscious evolution. Now man, possessing the knowledge of the laws of his development, could consciously and intelligently order the development of his society. Strong declared that it no longer was inevitable that civilizations should rise, degenerate and die.¹⁴

During the progressive era when so much attention was being assigned to the collection and significance of statistics, Strong was credited by his fellow social-gospel leaders and social reformers as being among the first to point out the social significance of statistics and factual information. Facts, themselves, were "God's alphabet," he wrote, enabling man "to decipher tendencies and tendencies are prophetic."¹⁵ Graham Taylor paid tribute to Strong as "a mediator of the new cove-

nant between facts and faith" who "invested church statistics with human interest, and the figures of the census, the departments of government, the board of trade and of organized labor with religious significance." Robert A. Woods wrote in 1916 from South End House in Boston that Strong should be recognized not only as one of the first in the United States to preach a new social and moral order but also "to combine the new hopes effectively with the study and knowledge of facts."¹⁶ A primary function of Strong's League for Social Service was to gather and distribute facts for social use.

Among the various natural laws discovered by science, Strong emphasized that the broadest and most basic of all was that of the law of unity in diversity. According to Strong the very law of the universe was "one from many" which meant "not the oneness of identity . . . but the oneness of coördination; not unison but harmony." Strong declared that this law already perfectly illustrated in the natural world, was as yet the unrealized ideal of the moral world. It was "the goal toward which the race had thus far slowly moved."¹⁷ Contrary to the popular idea so often presented by historians, Strong did not advocate the extermination of inferior races by the Anglo-Saxon race, but, on the contrary at various times wrote in terms of the needed harmony of races for the unity of mankind. He told Americans that they must recognize the value of the basic differences among the various races, for these differences supplemented and served one another. The law of progress, itself, he asserted, was that of "increasing differentiation with integration." Progress depended on "the differentiation of the individual and the higher organization of society made possible thereby."¹⁸

In view of the increasing sphere of governmental activity that both progressivism and applied Christianity advocated, it is interesting that Strong was one of the few leaders of the social-gospel group to point out and to discuss at great length the problem of finding a method of co-ordinating individual freedom with the organization of society as the essential problem of civilizations both past and present. He stressed that the two principles were not conflicting but coordinate ones, both equally important and necessary for the perfecting of the race. The individual and society were so related that the progress of each was conditioned by that of the other. He saw the twentieth century as "a new era" in the history of the race because for the first time, with the development of communication and transportation, there was possible both the development of a higher social organization, a world-life, and the stimulation of conflicting ideas which develops the individual. In modern society, he wrote, men were "unconsciously seeking" so to readjust social and economic relations as to coordinate the two seemingly conflicting principles. Strong's answer to the problem was the applica-

tion of the First and Second Commandments of Jesus. Here could be found the recognition of the two principles of individualism so necessary to the world's progress. What was needed was love, at once the attracting power in the moral universe and the harmonizing principle "which makes possible a unity in the midst of endless diversity."¹⁹ Strong believed that the kingdom fully come on earth would exhibit the complete development and coordination of the two principles of individuality and the organization of society.

Both progressivism and the social gospel based much of their social thought on the interpretation of society as an organism. According to Strong and other social-gospel ministers, an organic interpretation of society, with its corollary of social interdependence, was the scientific confirmation of the Second Commandment of Jesus—love of neighbor—which they believed Jesus had stressed. Richard T. Ely stated that the ethical concept of political economy proceeded from this assumption of the organic nature of society. Strong pointed out that the fundamental principle of every living organism was that of each for all and all for each, expressed in laws of service and sacrifice. Therefore, in society, which is "a vast organism, of which individual men and women are the cells, . . . these social cells must obey the law of service, if the social organism is to have health."²⁰ He maintained that disorders existed in society because man's will, through selfishness, could introduce disobedience to the laws of the social organism. Obedience to the basic laws of service and sacrifice, which would be perfect obedience to the laws of the social organism, thus creating a perfect society, could be achieved by rooting out selfishness through teaching Jesus' principle of "disinterested love." In his volume, *The Times and Young Men*, in 1900, Strong sought to prove that the laws were workable in industry, business, politics, journalism.

Such faith in the practicability of applying the Second Commandment of Jesus to all the institutions of society was basic in the social philosophy of the social gospel. Strong was well aware that critics would call his proposals impracticable, unrealistic, utopian. He maintained that society would not tumble if the principles of Jesus were applied, the form of application varying with circumstances. He would reject neo-orthodoxy's claim that it is "tortuously difficult if not impossible" to apply the personal virtues of the Sermon on the Mount to man's relations in economic and political groups. He wrote that those who declared that the laws of service, of sacrifice and of love will not work when you get out among men only "prove the truth of Jesus' word: 'Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God.'"²¹ In a statement typical of other social-gospel leaders, he declared:

Do you tell me that this is visionary, utopian? Do you declare such a moral miracle to be impossible? If it be indeed true that it is irrational to expect the church to exemplify her profession, visionary to imagine that her confession is sincere, utopian to dream that the spirit and teaching of Christ are ever to be realized in the lives of his professed followers, impossible for the church actually to accept the cross she preaches, then is her disability hopeless, and is she not only powerless to save, but she herself is past redemption; 'and there shall enlargement and deliverance arise from another place.' But I believe she has 'come to the kingdom for such a time as this.'²²

Strong urged all, rich and poor alike, to consecrate their lives and goods to the service of Christ or else cease to dishonor Christ by appropriating His name.

In making analogies with nature to explain religious and social laws, Strong went so far as to explain man's religious conversion in terms of the processes of nature. Thus he contended that whereas in nature everything must die unto self and be touched by life from a higher stage to enter that higher stage of existence, so, too, must man, to enter the kingdom, first prepare himself by complete self-surrender to God's will in order for God's love then to reach down and fill the vacuum left by the death of self. Once self-will had been surrendered to God's will, man's perfection and with it that of the world was limitless.²³

The reference to society as an organism was used by both progressives and advocates of social Christianity to focus attention on the interdependence of man in the new industrial age. Ely used the term "social solidarity" to convey this idea of interdependence. He complained in 1896 that the idea had received "comparatively little attention." Yet, Strong certainly made this concept a constant theme in all his writings, although he did not develop a concept of social sin from the social interdependence of man as did Ely and Ross. Strong maintained that the persistence of the old individualistic spirit of "every man for himself" in utter disregard of the social conditions of the new, collective society produced social evils. The watchword of the new era, he declared, must become "duties," the spirit of the new era must emphasize cooperation. However, the new social spirit must be properly enlightened by the social teachings of Jesus if it were to become truly unselfish. Likewise, the new social ideal of general comfort and universal wealth envisioned by all must be raised from the materialistic social ideal of creature comfort to the social ideal of Jesus, the full coming of the kingdom on earth.²⁴

Social duties rather than rights became a theme stressed by progressive reformers and social-gospel leaders. Strong, however, was one of the few who extended this concept to the world sphere. He, thus, should be recognized as among the first of his generation to repeatedly

point out the world responsibilities and duties of the United States in the new civilization. In 1900 he wrote in terms of the need for the development of a world-conscience which would recognize the world-duties of nations rather than national rights, which would sacrifice local interests to the world good because of the existence of a new world-life. To save the twentieth century from becoming "a menace to itself," the people must be reached with influences that would "inform the mind and enlighten the conscience." By 1916 Institutes of Social Service had been established in England, Sweden, Denmark, Italy, Spain, Germany, Austria, Russia and Argentina with the purpose of aiding nations to adjust to the new sociological age. Strong was also invited to organize institutes in Turkey, South Africa, India, China and Japan. Strong was certain that the teachings of Jesus and the teachings of science contained the solutions to the great world problems. He warned that if these teachings were not applied the new civilization would be "a hell on earth."²⁵

The progressive movement advocated moderate methods of reform. It stressed enlightening public opinion, widening popular participation in government and extending the sphere of government regulation of economic life. The social gospel was in complete agreement with these aims and methods. Strong argued, as did progressives, that an organic view of society demanded that any change in the institutions of society must be a guided, evolutionary change. Because society, the social organism, grew and was not made suddenly, all attempts to reconstruct society had to be by methods of social evolution. Sudden change and violence could not remedy social ills. A new social system could not be detailed and made ready for instant substitution in the place of the old. He believed that man could modify, help or hinder the progress of civilization, but he could not break from the past no matter how much he might wish to do so.

Strong questioned the wisdom of those reformers who would destroy the evils of existing institutions by abolishing the institutions—the industrial system, the church, the state, the family. He called these reformers the "unwise good" and declared:

All such reformers stand in suffering need of the truth that evolution is the method of social progress. When the scientific method is more generally known, there will be fewer patent systems for the salvation of society, fewer fools with the amazing conceit to say, 'When the world accepts my system,' and there will be fewer fools to run after them.²⁶

Thus Strong's conservative spirit tempered his belief in change. He called his moderate position one of "progressive conservatism." Washington Gladden, likewise, agreed with the need to pursue a middle course, to preserve, he wrote, a needed balance between conservatism and liberalism.²⁷ Strong founded the League for Social Service for

the very purpose of helping the institutions of society adjust gradually to the new social conditions. While his conservatism is evident in the need he saw for working with the institutions at hand, his progressivism is apparent in the need he saw for continued experimentation as the proper method of social adjustment in the fields of legislation, government, sanitation, philanthropy, religion and reform. All results, he asserted, successes or failures, "cast some ray of light on the great problem of readjustment." The League for Social Service, he believed, served "as a lens to gather up these scattered rays, focus them, and then reflect them to all who are willing to profit by other people's experience."²⁸ The League used as its slogan "Giving to All the Benefit of the Experience of Each."

The confidence that progressives placed in man's goodness and reasonableness was shared by those who preached social Christianity. To Strong and other social-gospel ministers, faith in the possibility of changing human nature was not illusionary, visionary or sentimental. While often qualifying his optimism by statements stressing the fact that the church had to work with the unredeemed man of the twentieth century and that the social ideal of the kingdom would not be achieved in this century or for many more to come, Strong nevertheless believed that both a near-perfected man and society were attainable and that such a view, once recognized, was in itself a force for good. Perfection must be made the ideal for man and society even though it may not be reached. Such a concept, he believed, was not only fundamental to Christian faith, but was also clearly upheld by the theory of evolution and progress. He asserted that Darwinism showed that the goal of nature's evolution is the perfecting of humanity. Gladden shared Strong's views and called "unscientific" any belief that human nature was "irreformable."²⁹ To Strong, belief in the possibility of a change in human nature through the denial of self-will was essential to the Christian philosophy. He declared that "If there is no such thing as disinterestedness, then Jesus blundered, and Christianity is a failure, for certainly Jesus taught it, and it is the object of Christianity to create it."³⁰ He reprimanded the churches for teaching that the absolute and unconditional surrender of the will was required only of the ripened saint, because it was too much to expect the same of the repenting sinner, of weak human nature. Such an attitude, he stated, is precisely "the fatal error of many pulpits which has made our churches large and weak. Because God is willing to accept the surrender of a very imperfect will, we must not imagine that he is willing to accept the imperfect surrender of the will."³¹ To Strong, man perfected was the great consummation of the divine plan which was not only taught by the revelation of the Bible but also by science.

Critics of the social gospel hold that its belief in the unlimited moral capacity of man, in the ability of man to deny self-will completely was naive and sentimental, and not good theology.³² Yet Strong was not "naively optimistic" as were, perhaps, later social-gospel leaders. He did place a reservation on the possibility of changing human nature when he used the term "near-perfected" man, when he pointed out that the kingdom would not come for generations, when he wrote that any progress, any perfection man achieved on earth was but a promise of the possibilities hereafter. In a sermon on immortality which he first delivered in Sandusky in 1878, and thereafter yearly until 1900, he stated that "our growth, our knowledge, our power to love, to do, to enjoy, however God-like, will always be only a beginning compared with the progress yet before the soul" in heaven. Strong chose to emphasize the ideal. He was confident that disinterestedness was a possible standard for human nature. Had not Jesus made the most exalted tribute ever paid to human nature by raising the standard of unselfishness and perfection to professional harlots and grafters and inviting them to accept it? Had not men and women from the dregs of society in all Christian ages responded to Christ's call and thereafter "demonstrated a new character by a new life"? Strong declared that his belief that the sin, degradation and sorrow of the world were all doomed and that the kingdom was steadily coming among men inspired him with the optimism to plan, the patience to wait, and the strength to work. He wrote, "If I had to believe that the sin and misery in the world were hopeless, it would take the heart out of me. I could work, but I should work like a galley-slave."³³

Much as Strong believed that man's imperfection was neither inevitable nor permanent, so, too, he confidently maintained that no social evil was inevitable, necessary or permanent. Social ills were an abnormal condition of society resulting from man's disregard of God's law through ignorance or selfishness. Science provided man with the means for eliminating his ignorance and the Gospel gave man the remedy for sin. The slum, itself, was born "of the ignorance and sin of a materialistic civilization." Selfishness, self-will, self-seeking—these were the essence of personal sin and of discord between nations, races, classes, and capital and labor. Strong declared that the world was "sick with selfishness."³⁴ He was certain that all attempts to regenerate society through legislation, a different system of taxation, the reorganization of society, new political parties or the reformation of old ones would fail as long as society remained selfish. He declared these attempts to be "only palliative, not remedial," for "the only radical remedy for our social ills is a new social spirit, the spirit of brotherhood, the spirit of love, vital enough to enter into, and to control, all relationships."³⁵

The interrelationship between environment and salvation was a constant theme of social-gospel writers. They agreed with progressives that the environment was a basic factor in the contemporary social problem. Moral progress did depend in large measure on physical conditions, Strong asserted, for the environment might determine whether or not a new life and spirit could grow and exist. He emphatically cautioned against the tendency of reformers, however, to believe that conditions could create the new spirit that was needed. The error of many reformers was, he charged, that they had sought to "work from the outside in," that they had tried to create life by the mere reorganization of society. He stressed that a change of form was not a change of essence, that newness of condition (education, suffrage, freedom of speech and press) could not be substituted for newness of life. Nevertheless, he warned, to neglect *either* the individual or the environment was "fatal folly."³⁶ He repeatedly urged the churches to recognize that they could not save people's souls without at the same time changing their environment. In Strong's opinion, both the individual and society had to be transformed at the same time. The salvation of every individual was necessary for the complete salvation of society; and the salvation of society was necessary for the complete salvation of the individual. The two were correlative. The unbalanced emphasis on man or environment led many reformers, he asserted, to espouse half truths. Thus, he concluded:

Almost every form of progress is hindered by half truths, by a partial recognition of facts. Some [reformers] refer all evils in the world to heredity (only they use a theological rather than the scientific term and call it 'original sin'). Others, like Bellamy with his parable of the rose-tree in the bog, attribute all evils to environment. One addresses all his efforts to saving the soul while he ignores the body. Another bends all his energies to saving the body and ignores the soul. Each wins a partial success because he recognizes a part of the truth, and each gains *only* a partial success because he fails to recognize the whole truth.³⁷

Both factors of the problem had to be reckoned with, and, Strong wrote, "it will be found that man needs a new heart quite as much as he needs a new environment."³⁸ Thus, while Strong's League for Social Service sought to reinforce the work of many remedial and reformatory agencies, its most important work was to be preventative by preaching what Strong believed to be the perfect solution of all problems, individual and social, the social gospel.

Progressivism was characterized by a note of crisis, of urgency. So too, social-gospel leaders presented their discussions of social problems in terms of crisis. Perhaps none wrote so persistently and dramatically in terms of crisis as Josiah Strong. He believed that social problems had to be faced realistically and solved immediately by practical measures if a catastrophe were to be avoided within the next gen-

eration. He asserted that men could not thwart nature's law of cause and effect. If readjustment to the new civilization was too long delayed, the only alternative was social revolution by violent revolution. If the pressing social problems were not properly solved, socialism or anarchy would result. If the social and economic conditions and tendencies existing in 1900 continued, the American "perpendicular political cleavage of society" would give place to "a horizontal cleavage between different social strata" which would be "as dangerous" as it would be "un-American." Whether or not American society would be dominated solely by class antagonism, Strong believed, depended on the *nature* and *speed* of reforms. There were many wrongs to be righted, he agreed. But, he commented, "The question is whether the work shall be committed to leaders who can recognize the rights of all classes, and who love justice for all, or shall be turned over to selfish charlatans, to whom the politic is ever just, and the profitable is always right."³⁹ And to Strong, those leaders who recognized "the rights of all classes" and loved "justice for all" were those who spoke in terms of cooperation between capital and labor under the capitalistic system. He, as well as other advocates of applied Christianity, favored arbitration of labor disputes and profit sharing plans. He urged both capital and labor to adopt the spirit of service and both would soon discover that their interests were mutual and that they were as dependent on each other "as are the two wings of a bird."⁴⁰

Strong, as a pioneer and leader of the social-gospel movement for more than thirty years, was not only ardent in the writing and preaching of his prophetic message but was, as John Haynes Holmes wrote, "statesmanlike in his ingenious devising of practical methods of action."⁴¹ This ability to devise plans and methods of implementing his social philosophy was exhibited in his work as Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance for the United States from 1886 to 1898. Believing that religion and reform were one, he advocated various plans of local alliances of clergy and laymen as a means of bringing the Christian conscience to bear on reforms and of gaining interdenominational church cooperation and leadership in coordinating and directing reform movements. In establishing the League for Social Service in 1898, he created what Professor Hopkins has called "the outstanding agency" during this period, "motivated by a definitely religious drive that was dedicated to the collection and dissemination of sociological data for reform purposes."⁴² Through the distribution of leaflets and slides on social questions, through information, library and lecture services and a monthly magazine, his organization was designed as an agency not only of educating public opinion but also of directing its expression. Believing that an awakened and enlightened public

opinion was the "generic reform," he devised and carried out plans for the systematic distribution of reform literature in the home. He was a leader in the movement for the establishment of social centers in schools. He advocated the establishment of municipal museums to supply information on experiments in municipal betterment in important cities of the world. He devised the method of "social revivals" for promoting community reforms and popularized the profession of social secretaries and social engineers for establishing good relations between employer and employee. He called for civic planning and scientific legislation, that is, legislation based on good laws that had proved workable elsewhere. He urged the adoption of the initiative, referendum and recall and was Vice-President of the New York State Group for the Adoption of the Initiative and Referendum. Strong's plans did not include any specific economic or political formulæ precisely because he believed that the basic evil in society was not a system, but human selfishness.⁴⁸ Social ills could be erased only by a changed human will and not by the redistribution of wealth, public ownership or a new form of government.

The social philosophy of applied Christianity was in many ways similar to that of progressivism. Both movements reflected the intellectual climate of the period and accepted many of the same basic social ideas. Strong's philosophy illustrates the concepts stressed by both movements, namely, faith in science and the scientific method, social use of the theory of evolution, of an organic concept of society, optimism concerning human nature and progress, the study of society and its social laws, a pragmatic and utilitarian outlook. Other themes commonly stressed by Strong and advocates of applied Christianity which had a social significance were those of the immanence of God, of the gradual realization of the kingdom on earth and of crisis and unprecedented opportunity for the church. Strong's emphasis on the need for the study of society and its laws, for the recognition of the effects of environment on the success of Christian work and for the adoption of scientific methods by the church in carrying into effect the law of love was an example of the persistent demand by leaders of the period for a Christian sociology. Politically, Strong was also in sympathy with the progressivism of his generation in its critical support of the capitalistic system, its realization of the need of increasing the regulatory power of government and its enthusiasm regarding the leadership and responsibility of the United States as a world power.

Typifying the moderate position of both the social gospel and progressivism, Strong's social philosophy was tempered with a quality of balance. It was progressive in its confidence that change, itself, in any field was not to be feared; it was conservative in its insistence that

change to be valid had to be built on the experience of the past. It was visionary in its dream of a utopia, the kingdom on earth; and it was realistic in its recognition of the frailty of man as he existed in the twentieth century, in its belief that the kingdom could not be realized instantly and in its assertion that any perfection on this earth was but a prelude to the hereafter. It was optimistic in its belief in continual progress and the perfectibility of man and society; yet this optimism was qualified by an awareness that man had the power to hasten or retard his progress. It was idealistic in its faith in eternal truths, yet it was pragmatic in its requirement that such absolute principles be made real in everyday life. Strong referred to his religion and philosophy as one of "practical idealism," and this "practical idealism" harmonized with what he termed the "progressive conservatism" of his social and economic views. Strong's social philosophy presented a middle-of-the-road view which was in harmony with and served to strengthen the moderate social, political and economic ideas of American progressivism.

1. Graham Taylor, *Pioneering on Social Frontiers* (Chicago, 1930), 380; Walter Rauschenbusch, *Christianizing the Social Order* (New York, 1913), 9; Washington Gladden, "Josiah Strong," *The Congregationalist and Christian World*, CI (May 11, 1916), 628.
2. Letters of tribute to Strong are in a miscellaneous collection provided by Elsie Strong in the author's possession. See also *New York Times*, May 8, 1916.
3. Charles Howard Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism, 1865-1915* (New Haven, 1940), 113-16, 260-63; Henry F. May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (New York, 1949), 194.
4. Josiah Strong, *The New Era or The Coming Kingdom* (New York, 1893), 11-12. For a summary of the influence of Darwinism on both the social gospel and progressivism see Richard Hofstadter, *Social Darwinism in American Thought* (Revised Edition, Boston, 1955), 105-22.
5. Josiah Strong, *Our World. The New World-Religion* (New York, 1915), 500, 395, 6; Josiah Strong, *The Times and Young Men* (New York, 1901), 214, 217-18; Josiah Strong, *The Next Great Awakening* (New York, 1902), 27, 104.
6. Josiah Strong, *Our World. The New World-Life* (New York, 1913), viii; Josiah Strong, *My Religion in Everyday Life* (New York, 1910), 38-39; Josiah Strong, *Religious Movements for Social Betterment* (New York, 1900), 17; Josiah Strong, "The Disproportionate Growth of the City," *Social Service. A Monthly Review of Social and Industrial Betterment*, I (September, 1906), 1-2; Strong, *World-Religion*, 501-3; *Next Great Awakening*, 22; *New Era*, 188. For statements by other social-gospel leaders on the harmony of science and social Christianity see Washington Gladden, *How Much Is Left of the Old Doctrines? A Book for the People* (Boston, 1899), 47, 17, 317-18, 27; Washington Gladden, *Applied Christianity. Moral Aspects of Social Questions* (Second Edition, Boston, 1886), 233-34, 189; Washington Gladden, *Ruling Ideas of the Present Age* (Boston, 1895), 296; Lyman Abbott, *The Evolution of Christianity* (Boston, 1892), 237, 20, 59; Lyman Abbott, *Christianity and Social Problems* (Boston, 1896), 84, 365.
7. Letter by Strong to the editors of *The Kingdom*, no date (1895?) in *Scrapbook*, IV, Evangelical Alliance for the United States. See also Strong, *World-Religion*, 10, 395; *Times and Young Men*, 163-64; Gladden, *Recollections* (Boston, 1909), 161, 86, 418; Graham Taylor, *Religion in Social Action* (New York, 1913), 8; Abbott, *Evolution of Christianity*, 72, 137, 170. For a discussion of the basic concepts of the social gospel see W. A. Visser't Hooft, *The Background of the Social Gospel in America* (Haarlem, 1928), 161, 39-43; J. Neal Hughley, *Trends in Protestant Idealism* (New York, 1948), 16-17, 121, 140-48.
8. Strong, *Times and Young Men*, 154-55; *New Era*, 12, 230, 37; Gladden, *Applied Christianity*, 231-33; Richard T. Ely, *Social Aspects of Christianity And*

- Other Essays* (New York, 1889), 122.
9. Strong, *Next Great Awakening*, 102, 104; *World-Religion*, 8, 18; *World-Life*, 164; Josiah Strong, *The Twentieth Century City* (New York, 1898), 41; Abbott, *Evolution of Christianity*, 247; Gladden, *Ruling Ideas*, 274, 280; *Recollections* 427.
 10. Strong, "Editorial," *Social Service*, III (April, 1901), 90; *World-Religion*, 514; *Times and Young Men*, 174; *New Era*, 121, 113; Gladden, *How Much Is Left of the Old Doctrines?*, 63, 42.
 11. Josiah Strong, "What the Kingdom Is," *The Gospel of the Kingdom*, II (January, 1910), 1-2; *New Era*, 227; *Next Great Awakening*, 115; *Times and Young Men*, 60; *World-Religion*, 518.
 12. Strong, *Times and Young Men*, 42-43; *World-Religion*, 29-30, 271-72; *Next Great Awakening*, 115; *New Era*, 20; Taylor, *Religion in Social Action*, 94; Gladden, *Ruling Ideas*, 12, 8; Lyman Abbott, *The Theology of an Evolutionist* (Boston, 1897), 10; J. B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress. An Inquiry Into Its Origin And Growth* (New York, 1932), 334-49.
 13. Strong, *World-Life*, 80; *New Era*, 230-31; Josiah Strong, *The Challenge of the City* (New York, 1907), 86; Josiah Strong, "The American Institute of Social Service," *Social Service*, VI (October, 1902), 71.
 14. Strong, *World-Life*, 3-4; *World-Religion*, 29-30; *Times and Young Men*, 215; Gladden, *Ruling Ideas*, 255-57; Taylor, *Religion in Social Action*, xxii; Ira V. Brown, *Lyman Abbott. Christian Evolutionist. A Study in Religious Liberalism* (Cambridge, 1953), 234.
 15. Strong, *World-Life*, 53; *New Era*, 53; *World-Religion*, 514.
 16. Tributes to Strong by Graham Taylor and Robert A. Woods, May, 1916, in the Elsie Strong Collection. See also reviews praising Strong's *Our Country for its use of facts, Our Country. Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis* (New York, 1885), Appendix, 1-4. See also Taylor, *Pioneering on Social Frontiers*, 399.
 17. Strong, *New Era*, 19; *World-Life*, 174; *World-Religion*, 111; Gladden, *Ruling Ideas*, 269, 245-46.
 18. Strong, *Religious Movements for Social Betterment*, 39; *World-Life*, 17, 39, 174 ff. *New Era*, 77-78, 19; Josiah Strong, "The Increasing Oneness of the World," *The Gospel of the Kingdom*, I (December, 1908), 17. For a statement to the effect that Strong "loudly announced in 1885 the rise of a progress theory built on combative racial and national pride," see Louis J. Budd, "The Idea of Progress at the Close of the Gilded Age," *The Georgia Review*, XI (Fall, 1957), 283.
 19. Strong, *New Era*, 116, 29; *World-Life*, 186; *Times and Young Men*, 220-21; Ely, *Social Aspects of Christianity*, 122, 127.
 20. Editorial note by Strong entitled "Service" and prefaced to his article, "The Law of Service Applied to Capital and Labor," *Social Service*, II (July, 1900), 7; editorial note by Strong, "Evolution not Revolution," *Social Service*, II (February, 1900), 3; Strong's review of *Introduction to Sociology* by Arthur Fairbanks, *Social Service*, III (June, 1901), 193. See also Strong, *Times and Young Men*, 73-74, 106-9; *Twentieth Century City*, 141, 123-25, 117; *Challenge of the City*, 185-86, 174-78; *World-Life*, 92, 95; Richard T. Ely, *The Social Law of Service* (New York, 1896), 252; Ely, *Social Aspects of Christianity*, 130; Gladden, *Applied Christianity*, 187; Gladden, *Ruling Ideas*, 83, 88, 94.
 21. Strong, *Times and Young Men*, 149-50; *Next Great Awakening*, 142. See also John Knox, "Christianity and the Christian," Henry P. Van Dusen, ed., *The Christian Answer* (New York, 1945), 165, 167; Paul Tillich, "The World Situation," *Ibid.*, 5-8, 21; Waldo Beach and John Coleman Bennett, "Christian Ethics," Arnold S. Nash, ed., *Protestant Thought in the Twentieth Century: Whence and Whither?* (New York, 1951), 143, 135.
 22. Strong, *World-Religion*, 516-17; *Next Great Awakening*, 154-56; *Times and Young Men*, 140-41; *New Era*, 121. For statements urging acceptance of the practicability of applying the Gospel see Gladden, *Applied Christianity*, 177; Gladden, *Recollections*, 419; Gladden, *The Church and Modern Life* (Boston, 1908), 106, 194; Abbott, *Evolution of Christianity*, 235; Taylor, *Religion in Social Action*, 81, 100; Ely, *Social Aspects of Christianity*, 29.
 23. Strong, *Times and Young Men*, 174-75, 187-91, 73-74; *World-Religion*, 135-39; *Next Great Awakening*, 140.
 24. Strong, *Times and Young Men*, 117-23, 219; *Challenge of the City*, 170-72; *Next Great Awakening*, 196. See also Richard T. Ely, *Socialism An Examination of Its Nature, Its Strength And Its Weakness, With Suggestions for Social Reform* (New York, 1894), 94; Ely, *The Labor Movement in America* (New York, 1886), 319; Ely, *The Social Law of Service*, 127, 155; Taylor, *Religion in Social Action*, 47-51, 73, 92; Washington Gladden, *Burning Questions Of the Life That Now Is And Of That Which Is To Come* (New York, 1890), 241-42; Washington Gladden, *Social Salvation* (Boston, 1902), 6, 85; Washington Gladden, *Rights and Duties. An Address Delivered At the Fifty-Eighth Annual Commencement of the University of Michigan, Thursday, June*

- 19, 1902 (Ann Arbor, 1902); Gladden, *Ruling Ideas*, 12; Gladden, *Recollections*, 294.
25. Strong, *World-Life*, ix; Josiah Strong, *Expansion Under New World-Conditions* (New York, 1900), 272, 245-46.
26. Strong, *Times and Young Men*, 216-17; *New Era*, 10. See also Strong, "Evolution not Revolution," *Social Service*, II (February, 1900), 3; Strong, "The Home and Social Betterment," *Social Service*, II (June, 1900), 7-10; Gladden, *Social Salvation*, 5; Abbott, *The Church and Social Problems*, 133; Abbott, *Evolution of Christianity*, v.
27. Josiah Strong, "Prospectus," *The League for Social Service* (New York, 1898), 4, 8. See also Gladden, *Ruling Ideas*, 255-57; Taylor, *Religion in Social Action*, xxii; Brown, *Lyman Abbott*, 234.
28. Josiah Strong, "Why the League for Social Service," *Social Service*, V (September, 1902), 43.
29. Strong, *Times and Young Men*, 187-91, 74-75; *New Era*, 21, 290, 223; *World-Religion*, 139-40, 153, 108; *Next Great Awakening*, 142. See also Gladden, *Recollections*, 96, 313-14; Gladden, *Ruling Ideas*, 23; Gladden, *How Much Is Left of the Old Doctrines?*, 228-29; Abbott, *Evolution of Christianity*, 251-54; Abbott, *Theology of An Evolutionist*, 188-90.
30. Strong, *World-Religion*, 216.
31. Strong, *World-Religion*, 489, 235, 24; *Next Great Awakening*, 129-30.
32. Beach and Bennett, "Christian Ethics," in Nash, *Protestant Thought*, 131-34; Walter M. Horton, "Systematic Theology," *op. cit.*, 120.
33. Strong, *Times and Young Men*, 16, 18, 218-19; *World-Religion*, 170-71, 53, 109-11; *New Era*, 125; manuscript sermon by Strong on immortality in the Elsie Strong Collection in the author's possession. See also Gladden, *Recollections*, 417.
34. Strong, *World-Religion*, 194, 189; *New Era*, 230, 241-42; *Challenge of the City*, 55; *Next Great Awakening*, 115; *Religious Movements for Social Betterment*, 31; *Times and Young Men*, 102, 16, 110-13; Gladden, *Church and Modern Life*, 89-90.
35. Strong, *Twentieth Century City*, 140-41, 117; *Our Country*, 111; *Challenge of the City*, 173-74; *World-Life*, 93; *Religious Movements for Social Betterment*, 40-41; *New Era*, 39. See also, Abbott, *Evolution of Christianity*, 176; Gladden, *Church and Modern Life*, 131.
36. Strong, *Next Great Awakening*, 190; *Our Country*, 180.
37. Josiah Strong, "The American Institute of Social Service," *Social Service*, VI (October, 1902), 66; Strong, *New Era*, 130; *Next Great Awakening*, 95; *Religious Movements for Social Betterment*, 16-17; *Challenge of the City*, 4, 95, 160; *World-Religion*, 29, 143.
38. Strong, *New Era*, 119, 193; Josiah Strong, "The Signs of the Times and the Churches," *Charities Review*, VI (March, 1897), 13. See also Gladden, *Ruling Ideas*, 68, 261-62; Gladden, *Social Salvation*, 136-38; Abbott, *Church and Social Problems*, 129-30, 133; Taylor, *Religion in Social Action*, 23, 38, 223-24.
39. Strong, *Challenge of the City*, 158-59, 163; *Our Country*, 143-44, 195; *World-Life*, 223-27; Hopkins, *Rise of Social Gospel*, 110, 135, 322.
40. Strong, *Times and Young Men*, 113; Josiah Strong, "The Mutual Interests of Capital and Labor," *Social Service*, IV (October, 1901), 103-5.
41. John Haynes Holmes, "Josiah Strong," *Dictionary of American Biography*, XVIII, 151.
42. Hopkins, *Rise of Social Gospel*, 259-60.
43. For criticism of Strong as one who advocated action by social service activities as a substitute for political action and reform see Robert R. Roberts, "Economic and Political Ideas Expressed in the Early Social Gospel Movement, 1875-1900," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1952, 123-24, 151.

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

"An Inquiry into Communal Authority in the Ancient Church with Particular Emphasis Upon the Laity." By Charles Jarvis Speel 2nd (Monmouth College, Monmouth, Illinois). Harvard University, 1955. Director: George H. Williams.

There were four principal sources of authority in the ancient church: 1. the Holy Spirit, 2. conciliar decisions, 3. tradition, 4. Scripture. Of these, the Holy Spirit was the principal or ultimate source.

There were four principal types of authority: 1. teaching authority, 2. legislative authority, 3. liturgical authority, 4. the authority of consentient testimony. All were working authorities, but the fourth was also the ultimate or *de facto* authority and was primarily exercised by the laity.

Eight distinguishable channels of authority existed in the ancient church: 1. the laity (*laos tou Theou*), 2. apostles, prophets and teachers, 3. individual believers, 4. councils, 5. clergy in general, 6. bishops in particular, 7. the bishop of Rome, 8. emperors and magistrates (in this order chronologically).

The Spirit came directly from God or Christ, as a free gift to Christians; it was not earned by works or faith, but it came only upon those who believed and obeyed. Its reception was not dependent upon any rite or any human dispenser. The Spirit was the Christian's chief source of authority. The Spirit-filled laity was active and well recognized in the ancient church.

Numerous examples from the first four centuries, in which the laity exercised all four types of authority, show that the Christ-loving laity was the prime preserver of the faith and the most potent force for unity in the ancient church.

During Cyprian's episcopate the faithful laity forced Cyprian and his episcopal colleagues to modify their views with reference to the lapsed in a series of six dramatic changes. The

subsequent course of penitential history was thus affected. Cyprian said that he who is not with the bishop is not in the church. It would have been far truer to say that he who departed from the *depositum fidei* or the faithful laity, as the preserver of that faith, was not in the church.

Throughout the first four centuries the laity was in actuality, as well as in theory, the ultimate authority in the matter of establishing and maintaining clerics in their offices. Abundant evidence proves that the most common method of establishing clerics in office was by "lay" selection, followed by clerical approval. In cases where the laity opposed the choice of clerics by clerics or by magistrates, the "lay" authority prevailed, forcing the opposition to yield. Every known instance of lay action in regard to clerical office-holding illustrates the laity's concern for the preservation of the faith and the unity of the church. The laity was a steady and faithful witness bearer, an active working authority as well as an ultimate and *de facto* authority. Its role, during one of the most fruitful periods of the church's growth, should be re-examined for what it may offer to today's church.

"Eastern Lutheranism in American Society and American Christianity, 1870-1914: Darwinism, Biblical Criticism, the Social Gospel." Reginald W. Deitz (Hartwick College, Oneonta, New York). University of Pennsylvania, June, 1958. Director: Dr. Wallace E. Davies. L. C. Card No. Mic. 58-3317.

This dissertation is concerned with the reactions of two Lutheran bodies, the General Synod and the General Council, to Darwinian science, biblical criticism, and the social gospel. Against a background of contemporary thinking a wide assortment of Lutheran literature was examined: weekly papers, scholarly journals, volumes of theology, sermons, essays, meditations,

fiction, and biography, as well as more fugitive tracts and pamphlets.

Although there was much conservative opposition, many Lutheran leaders were inclined to accept a theistic form of evolutionary science as compatible with evangelical Christian faith. Similarly, unbound by literalistic theories of inspiration, many of them also quietly accepted the methods and principles of the new higher critical scholarship and helped save the Lutheran church from a modernist-fundamentalist split.

The social gospel found many sympathetic spirits in these churches, especially toward the close of the period, but no real program of social action was ever developed. Social conservatism can be traced to a theological heritage traditionally interpreted as social irrelevance and also to the renewal, throughout these decades, of conservative religious, economic, and cultural patterns by successive waves of Luther-

an immigrants, bringing alien viewpoints into the church. Thus Americanization was retarded.

In contrast to widely held conceptions of Lutheran aloofness and isolation, this study reveals impressive evidences of genuine awareness of and participation in the intellectual enterprises of nineteenth and early twentieth century American Protestantism. Lutheran separateness, it suggests, was not simply immigrant cultural nationalism but an earnest resistance to the compromises into which much American Protestantism in this period had been betrayed. The church's deviation from the common patterns of American Protestantism was prompted by both immigrant alienation and evangelical conservatism. But this study shows that distinctiveness did not prevent persistent conversation with contemporary culture and a serious effort to be at once evangelical, American, relevant, and churchly.

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

April 17, 1959

The Council met at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, April 17, 1959, with President Robert T. Handy presiding.

The following persons were elected members of the society, subject to the fulfillment of the usual constitutional provision: Lloyd J. Averill, Jr., John D. Collins, Joseph R. Curry, Samuel D. Faircloth, George J. Griffin, Alton O. Hancock, Marvin Harper, John H. Leith, Leon McBeth, Robert A. Macosky, Jack W. Manning, George N. Marshall, Robert Moats Miller, James H. Overton, Jr., W. Morgan Patterson, Richard M. Spielman, John Van Kommer, Sam J. Womack, Jr., Lemoine G. Lewis, Klaus Penzel, Arthur L. Walker.

The following papers were read: "The Rise of the 'New Theology' in Japanese Protestantism," by E. Luther Copeland; "The Social Gospel Movement and Race Theories," by Thomas F. Gossett; "Karl Holl and the 'Schwärmer'," by Hans J. Hillerbrand; "The Roman Catholic Church and the French Revolution," by George V. Taylor; "King John of England: An Illustration of the Medieval Practice of Charity," by Charles R. Young; "John Wyclif and the Tradition of Biblical Authority," by William Mallard.

Attest: Winthrop S. Hudson,
Secretary

BOOK REVIEWS

The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies. By FRANK MOORE CROSS, JR. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1958. 196 pp., 4 plates. \$4.50.

Church history students who read these Haskell Lectures (as they should) may be tempted to pay attention only to the last chapter, "The Essenes and the Primitive Church." This temptation should be resisted, since yielding to it would mean overlooking the valuable "catalogue of the library," the historical proof that the priestly apocalyptists of Qumran are indubitably the Essenes, the identification of the Wicked Priest with Simon (142-134 B.C.), and an analysis of "the Old Testament at Qumran." Only by considering this analysis first can we agree or disagree with Cross's statement (p. 147) that "the Essenes prove to be the bearers, and in no small part the producers, of the apocalyptic traditions of Judaism." Thus, as he says, we can now know something of the *Sitz im Leben* of Jewish apocalyptic and can far better assess its relation to apocalyptic in the New Testament, as well as in the "Jewish-Christian theology" of which Daniélou has recently written. Like other writers, Cross emphasizes the Essene affinities of the Gospel of John, eschatological motifs common to Essenes and Christians, and similarities present in their order and liturgical institutions; unlike some others, he also lays stress on the differences between the two "apocalyptic communities," and finds the principal *differentia* of Christianity in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. One might also mention the absence of Holy War in early Christian thought.

As the shape of Essenism becomes more clearly defined—and this book marks a notable advance—it becomes evident that much of early Christian history will need reexamination. (Cf. J. Daniélou, *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme*, Paris, 1958). The relation of Essenism to gnosis requires

further investigation, and older categories will need to be revised (including some used by Cross: "Greek" or "gnostic" versus "sectarian Judaism," p. 161). For this reason church historians must consider the Scrolls.

ROBERT M. GRANT
University of Chicago

A New Eusebius. Edited by J. STEVENSON. London: SPCK, 1957. 427 pp. 21s.

A new edition of Kidd's documents of the early church to the Age of Constantine has to be welcomed heartily. There is not enough source material available to the student of the early church. Mr. J. Stevenson of Cambridge has not simply reedited Kidd but has created a new book. He has included some excellent material which will be of great value to the students (Bardaisan, Mani); he has offered striking texts which will interest the scholar (Galen, and on the Meletian schism); and he has treated the church fathers thoroughly (Origen, Tertullian, Clement, Cyprian). The documentation on the age of Constantine is excellent.

There are two things which I regret very much. On one hand, the title is confusing for a book which is intended for the beginning student. Secondly, the Apostolic Fathers are not sufficiently represented. Clement of Rome and Ignatius should be given considerably more space in a work which devotes 30 pages to gnosticism. For the whole early period, for the episcopal and sacramental concepts, as well as for the whole hellenistic theology of Clement, one must ask the student to read in addition the Apostolic Fathers. Perhaps Mr. Stevenson has had this in mind, but then he should state this *expressis verbis*.

I have one more suggestion. The "Documents" of the early church are not merely the writings. The works of art, the frescoes of the catacombs, the symbolism, the architecture of the Constantinian age are also documents. Obviously financial matters are involv-

ed here, but it is still regrettable that all source books on the early church represent this period as if only the written form and not the work of art "document" it. Would it be possible for Mr. Stevenson to consider this realm if he works out the second volume which I hope will appear soon?

SAMUEL LAEUCHLI
Garrett Biblical Institute

The Patriarch Nicephorus of Constantinople. Ecclesiastical Policy and Image Worship in the Byzantine Empire. By PAUL J. ALEXANDER. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1958. xiii, 287 pp. \$8.00.

This book was conceived as an essay in the history of the Iconoclastic Controversy. The aim of the author was to define the role played by Nicephorus in the struggle and his contribution to the theology of Icons. The main merit of the book is in the use of the unpublished work of Nicephorus, *Refutatio et Eversio*, which, as Professor Alexander rightly observes, is a kind of a *summa* of the whole controversy. In the Appendix to the book a summary of this treatise is given, with a few passages in translation (242-262). It is gratifying to learn that a critical edition of the original text is in preparation (X). The present book is better documented than another recent study on the same subject by Dr. A. J. Visser, *Nikephoros und der Bilderstreit*, 1952.

But there is no real advance in the interpretation of the documentary evidence. Professor Alexander's analysis of Nicephorus' own "theory of religious images" (ch. VII, 189-213) is sorely inadequate. The "scholastic element" in Nicephorus' argumentation and its close dependence upon the Aristotelian categories are well presented. Yet the reader cannot get from this discussion any clear idea of Nicephorus' conception of the Holy Icons. A detailed comparison of Nicephorus' ideas with those of St. Theodore of Studium would have been more helpful at this point. Not enough is said about St. Theodore in the book

and this omission unduly narrows the perspective.

Professor Alexander does not claim originality for the first chapters of his book, dealing with the problem of Religious Images in the Ancient Church (1-53). His use of sources, and also of the scholarly literature, is rather one-sided. Unfortunately, he relies too much on Harnack's interpretation, especially in his well known essay, "Der Geist der morgenländischen Kirche" (1913). This essay of Harnack is notorious for its bias and for that reason it does not deserve that confidence which Professor Alexander bestows upon it. Actually, in this article Harnack only spells out his basic contention, expressed already in *Das Wesen des Christentums*, that the Eastern Church was not Christian at all (cf. Ernst Benz, *Die Ostkirche im Lichte der Protestantischen Geschichtsschreibung von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart*, München 1952, s. 230-256; Harnack's article first appeared in the Berlin *Sitzungsberichte* for 1913, was then included in the volume of his collected essays, *Aus der Friedens- und Kriegsarbeit*, 1916, and was recently reprinted in his *Ausgewählte Reden und Aufsätze*, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1951, s. 80-112).

On the other hand, Professor Alexander did not use sufficiently the relevant theological literature, which could have suggested to him some other avenues of interpretation. His treatment of the basic concept of "image" is inadequate (p. 23 f.) The "icon" is, basically and by design, a portrait, i.e. a presentation of a real person. Now, a portrait is *neither* a "symbol," *nor* an "essential image." Both St. Theodore and Nicephorus endeavoured to elaborate the concept of an "image," which would express this specific character of the icon. Professor Alexander could have profited much from the instructive analysis of the problem by Professor von Campenhausen, "Die Bilderfrage als theologisches Problem der Alten Kirche," in *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 49. I, 1952, s. 33-60, and even from the earlier study by E. Benz, "Christliche Mystik und Christ-

liche Kunst," in *Deutsche Vierteljahrschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte*, XII.1, 1934, s. 22-48. Neither is included in the Bibliography, nor are the admirable articles by Lucas Koch, in the *Benediktinische Monatschrift*. On the whole his "Bibliography" is incomplete: especially Russian literature is very inadequately mentioned—even Ostrogorsky's Russian articles in the *Seminarium Kondakovianum* are not included; the works of Grossu and Dobroklonsky's St. Theodore of Studium are omitted, as well as Bolotov's *Lectures on the History of the Ancient Church*, where, in the IVth volume, a penetrating analysis of the Iconoclastic Controversy is given. The main weakness of Alexander's study is precisely in the lack of theological apprehension. There is much of valuable information in the book, but as an essay in interpretation the book is a failure.

GEORGES FLOROVSKY
Harvard Divinity School.

Kirchenväter und Soziales Erbrecht: Wanderungen religiöser Ideen durch die Rechte der östlichen und westlichen Welt. By EBERHARD F. BRUCK. Berlin, Göttingen, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 1956. xi, 286 pp. DM36.

An evaluation for the church historian of this detailed tracing of the patristic influence on the laws and canons respecting bequests to the church is long overdue. In many journals devoted to law and civilization it has been enthusiastically received as definitive and epoch-making far beyond its seemingly limited scope.

The primitive church of Jerusalem practiced the community of goods. Jesus had enjoined the rich (Matthew 19:21) to sell all and give to the poor. Though the church early abandoned its primitive communism, the ideal lingered especially in connection with the love-feasts and eucharistic offerings in kind; and the deacons, eventually under the archdeacon (and later also widows and deaconesses), assumed extensive eleemosynary responsibilities for the poor, the imprisoned, and those stricken by circumstance.

For example, every excavated North African church has proved to have had a built-in granary.

With the establishment of the church in the fourth century and the intensification of Christian responsibility for a vastly increased membership, the tithes and alms of the faithful no longer sufficed; and thought was given as to how the church could appropriately receive bequests. It is at this point in the history of Christian charity that Dr. Eberhard Bruck of Harvard (and formerly of the universities of Breslau and Bonn) begins his account in showing two main currents of patristic theory and practice, namely, that of the Greek Fathers, notably the Cappadocians and Chrysostom (perpetuated in the West, among others, by the Celtic missionaries) and secondly that of the Latin Fathers, notably Jerome, Augustine, and Caesarius of Arles, revived after a lapse in Western canon law. Bruck traces in fascinating detail the rise, the pagan antecedents, the socio-religious motivation, the interrelationship, and finally the deformation of these two patristic impulses in the charitable assignment and the socio-economic involvement of the church.

Basil in the midst of his monks and his asylums for orphans and the ailing and impoverished of Caesarea sought endowment for his charitable enterprises, suggesting that a proper portion of a testator's inheritance should be shared with the church in a practical compromise between the primitive ideal of the community of goods (still surviving intact among the monks) and the legitimate expectation of offspring and other dependents. He and the two Cappadocian Gregories were aware of the Neoplatonic ideal of philanthropy and the sharing of possessions and they stressed the propitious consequences for the salvation of the generous testator's soul of a proper quota of his estate for the poor. It was Chrysostom who elaborated, standardized, and popularized the quota as precisely *one-third* of the testator's estate.

Jerome, in contrast, suggested a flexible fraction consonant with the number

of a testator's dependents, introducing (in *epistolae* cxviii c. 400 and cxx c. 406) the notion of a "quota for Christ" equivalent to the *portion of one son*. Augustine, with whom this notion has been long associated, popularized it (in *sermones* ix, liiiv, cccliii and elsewhere) in the injunctions: *fac locum Christo cum filiis tuis* and *da filiis tuis Christum coheredem*. The "Augustinian" compromise did not immediately come to prevail in the West (though eventually incorporated with qualifications by Gratian); for there were survivals in Gaul of the older ideal of complete sharing, while even the Justinianic Digests gave the church a firmer grip on a larger proportion of the testator's inheritance than Augustine.

The older ideal of giving all to the church and the poor survived, Bruck points out, in Salvian (*Iusta Patrimonii Portio*) and Peter Chrysologus. John Cassian may have mediated something of the more rigorous Eastern ideal. (It would be interesting at this point to explore, on the basis of Bruck's work, any possible connection between the transformation of primitive communism into a fraction of a testator's estate and the addition in Gaul of the article on the *Communio sanctorum* to the Western version of the Apostles' Creed in the early fifth century, i.e. the transmutation of the community of goods into a communion with deceased saints.)

Especially interesting is Bruck's demonstration of the fact that by way of the refugee Syrian clerics and the omnipresent Levantine merchants the Cappadocian quota of one third for the poor was adopted in Visigothic Spain (not with certainty, possibly indigenous) and by the Celtic Christians where it found codification in the numerous Hibernian collections of canon law. Here the quota is characteristically called the *tertia Deo*. It is expressly derived from an unknown *Libri de hereditibus* ascribed interestingly to Origen. The *tertia Deo* seems in some canons to involve not only movables but also lands which presumably were thereupon received back to be cultivat-

ed by the descendants of the testator as vassals of the church or monastery.

The persistence of the *tertia* going back to Chrysostom and the Cappadocian Fathers as the fixed portion of the movables a testator could legitimately bequeath may be noted in the altered context and complete shift of mood in eighteenth century England where, according to the Custom of London not abolished until 1724, the amount which a testator might legally bequeath away at the expense of his heirs and widow was still fixed at one third.

Professor Bruck in his massive commentary, as it were, on the intellectual, institutional, and legal implications of Matthew 19:21 has masterfully placed law within the scope of theology and brought patristics within the purview of the court.

GEORGE H. WILLIAMS

Harvard Divinity School

Studies in the Early British Church.
Edited by NORA K. CHADWICK. New
York: Cambridge University Press,
1958. 374 pp. \$8.50.

It is virtually impossible to do justice to this volume in the brief limits of the conventional review. Its wealth of information can only be suggested by a few notes, comments, and description.

Slightly more than one half of the book was written by Nora K. Chadwick, namely, the lengthy Introduction, Chap. I, "Early Culture and Learning in North Wales," and Chap. II, "Intellectual Life in West Wales in the Last Days of the Celtic Church." Kathleen Hughes accounts for Chap. III, "British Museum MS Cotton Vespasian A. xiv (*Vitae Sanctorum Walensium*): its purpose and provenance," and Chap. V, "The Distribution of Irish Scriptoria and Centres of Learning from 730 to 1111." The remaining chapters (IV, "The Archbishops of St. David's, Llandaff and Caerleon-on-Usk," and VI, "The Sources for the Life of St. Kentigern") are by Christopher Brooke and Kenneth H. Jackson respectively. The Chadwick and Hughes chapters are in general highly technical palaeographical

discussions, while the Brooke and Jackson chapters are in general narrative, although these characterizations must not be pressed to their logical conclusions.

The period dealt with is Britain between the departure of the Romans and the foundation of Saxon England, but a large proportion of the study concerns documents and institutions of the Norman period which throw light on Celtic Britain. A fascinating illustration of this procedure is the critical analysis of two twelfth-century *Vitae* of St. Kentigern, a thirteenth-century breviary, and a sixteenth-century breviary. Through the usual methods of working from the known to the unknown, the author arrives at six original sources (none of which exist today) going back to the tenth or eleventh century.

What may appear superficially to be a minute study of the *Lives* of Celtic saints becomes, of course, a consideration of "ecclesiastical propaganda . . . integrated as a series of hagiographical narratives," the last stand of the individuality and independence of the old British church against the successful encroachments of the Romanizing party. Once again the rough-and-ready quality of the old order stands out in contrast to the smooth but nonetheless engulfing tide flowing from Rome by way of Canterbury and York. But the resistance was vigorous and "no punches were pulled." Even forgery was a method. It is noted, tongue in cheek, that "forgery was a profession." An amusing comparison between a serious historical research student and a gang of ingenious crooks is intimated in the statement that "it was the same set of needs and interests which gave them their chance"!

If some criticism is to be offered, it is the minor one that the authors have apparently not always kept their purpose in mind. It seems (to me) that too much attention is paid to materials of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, rather than to the period with which the book is supposed to deal.

ALLEN CABANISS
University, Mississippi.

Church, Kingship and Lay Investiture in England, 1089-1135. By NORMAN F. CANTOR. (Vol. X of Princeton Studies in History.) Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958. 349 pp. \$6.00.

Here is a fine study of the background and effects of the "concordat" of 1107 between Henry I and Paschal II which ended the investiture contest in England. It begins with a reassessment of previous works on the English investiture controversy (Böhmer, Liebermann, Fliche, *et alia*), and, rejecting all attempts to link it to continental movements, sets it firmly within the peculiar development of the Norman church-state system as it evolved on English soil. Further differentiating the English investiture contest from its continental counterpart was the genuine respect for this system which tempered the reforming zeal of Lanfranc and Anselm of Canterbury. Finally, the English struggle between church and state is correlated to the political history of the country during the reigns of William II and Henry I.

Henry needed Anselm's support to buttress his claim to the throne. Anselm was torn between a loyalty to Henry and the vagaries of a vacillating reform policy in Rome. Paschal II enters the story as a "fanatical high Gregorian" who drove Anselm to conflict with his king and then abandoned him. The compromise of 1107 was the result of Henry's need of papal support for his seizure of Normandy, Paschal's hope that English arms would aid in his proposed crusade against Byzantium, and Anselm's moderate and mediating attitude. But Anselm himself was not the spiritual father of the compromise any more than Henry or Paschal.

After rejecting the view that Ivo of Chartres had any influence on the compromise, Cantor finds its sources in the circle of the King, particularly in Robert of Meulan and Gerard of York. In the course of developing this argument, Cantor argues convincingly that Gerard was the author of the *York Tractates* (the view originally advanced

by Böhmer and since attacked by many) and accounts for inconsistencies within the *Tractates* by linking them to Gerard's spiritual evolution from theocratic monarchist to radical Gregorian reformist. But he denies to the *Tractates* any direct influence upon the parties involved in the compromise.

In the agreement of 1107 Henry made no real concessions to the Pope, only theoretical ones. He retained strong veto powers which gave him a very real control over episcopal appointments. Paschal made his concessions for private political reasons and hoped to have them rescinded later, hence the fact that the compromise was never committed to writing.

But by 1124 an anti-Gregorian movement seized power in Rome and abandoned the revolutionary fanaticism of the early reformers for a more moderate policy of political consolidation. Therefore, Henry was left to reestablish quietly his hegemony over the English church, that is, to reconstitute in practice, if not in theory, the traditional Norman church-state system.

Thus envisaged, the dispute between Henry II and Becket was merely the second phase of a conflict which had been all but resolved by Henry I and Anselm. Henry II could argue convincingly that he was merely restoring the system established by his grandfather and recognized by Paschal II. Becket, "the last of the Gregorians," found little support in Rome because Gregorianism itself had been moderated by the anti-Gregorian reaction.

HAYDEN V. WHITE
The University of Rochester.

The Answer. By JOHN NORTON. Translated from the Latin by Douglas Horton. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1958. xxi, 196 pp. \$4.75.

Because Norton's *Answer*, published in a single edition in 1648, was written in Latin, it hardly made a dent on the ecclesiastical controversies of the time. In a few short years it was merely a title. In the nineteenth century Dexter listed it, but Williston Walker, who could have used it to good advantage,

was apparently unaware of its existence. When Douglas Horton recently came upon it, he felt like "Hilkiah the priest who had discovered the book of the law in the dust of the house of the Lord." After reading the book, one can easily understand his enthusiasm. Not only is it an admirable little volume in itself, but it is, without doubt, the most judicious ecclesiological statement to issue from New England in the seventeenth century. This may be stated even with due consideration of the *Cambridge Platform* and the writings of Cotton and Hooker.

Behind the book lies the concern of reformed continental theologians over the precise ecclesiology of developing Congregationalism. The matter had been officially raised by the Walcheren classis of the Dutch churches. Apollonius, minister at Middelburg, was chosen to draw up a list of questions that, if answered, would clarify the issues. In course of time John Norton, minister at Ipswich, was asked by the five dissenters of Westminster and the New England clergy to answer them. It was a happy choice.

Twenty-five questions in sixteen ecclesiological categories were submitted. Norton answered each in a forthright manner. What emerges is a handbook of New England ecclesiological theory and practice, much richer than the *Platform*, much clearer than Hooker's *Summe*. And what is even more surprising is Norton's breadth of ecumenical concern. He is conscious of Congregationalism as a distinct ecclesiological type, yet his answers are of such scope that other polities are not excluded from the essence of a true church. At the end he prays that the churches may continue the search "for truth in charity between compromises on the left hand and separation on the right."

It is unfortunate that Norton's *Answer* has not been generally available before this for both students of the seventeenth century and ecumenists. We owe Douglas Horton a debt of gratitude for his assiduous search in the lumber rooms of the temple and the revivifying of this long lost volume. It

has been beautifully translated and handsomely printed.

VERNE D. MOREY

Fort Kent, Maine

Richard Baxter and Puritan Politics. By RICHARD SCHLATTER. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1957. 178 pp. \$4.50.

This book contains both first publications and reprints of political writings of an influential moderate Puritan of 17th century England. The material has been edited to eliminate the repetitions that make Baxter so deadly to read. The selections reflect four stormy decades in English politics.

The first is a letter to Edward Harley who had been elected, though never seated, as a member of the second Parliament of the Protectorate in 1656. The second selection is a letter to John Swinfen during the early days of Richard Cromwell's Parliament in February, 1659. Following this are chapters from *A Holy Commonwealth* written in answer to James Harrington's *Oceana* at the time of Richard's downfall in 1659. Later that year, during the interregnum, Baxter wrote an answer to "the Overturners and New Modelers of the Government," also included by Schlatter.

A letter to Thomas Bampfield gives us Baxter's political thoughts during the early days of the Restoration. As a sample of his position during the Great Persecution there is a tract written in response to a book-burning at Oxford in 1683. Finally, Schlatter presents a document from the last year in Baxter's life where he seeks to prove the abdication of James II in order to support the legitimacy of William III.

Schlatter feels that the liberal political thought of 17th century England is well known to historians, and a recent edition of the writings of Sir Robert Filmer makes available the arguments of the conservative Royalist. In Baxter's political writings we have the arguments of conservative Puritan politics.

Schlatter takes exception to those historians who would make democratic

heroes of Puritans to whom democracy was a bad word. At the same time he feels that we are in a position to appreciate their point of view if we substitute the term "Communist" where Baxter says "Papist" and if we use the term "subversive teaching" where Baxter speaks of "preaching up heresy."

One exception to be made concerning Schlatter's introduction is where he speaks of Baxter's churchmanship as being between the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists. I suppose this is based upon Baxter's work in developing the Worcestershire Association during the Protectorate. Baxter was then attempting the best that could be obtained in polity under the adverse circumstances, but his actual preference was for a moderate episcopacy. He should be placed somewhere between Anglicans and Presbyterians.

JAMES C. SPALDING

State University of Iowa.

Essays on the Later Stuarts. By GODFREY DAVIES. San Marino: Huntington Library, 1958. 133 pp. \$4.00.

This volume contains the last contributions of Godfrey Davies to the history of Stuart England. When Davies died in 1957 he left two completed essays, "Tory Churchmen and James II" and "The Control of British Foreign Policy by William III." To these a third, "Charles II in 1660," originally published in 1956, has been added to complete this book. All three studies are models of dispassionate, judicious, and illuminating investigation by a scholar who was surpassed in knowledge of his field by none.

The essay on Charles II considers the published sketches of the restored monarch and examines these critically. Charles in 1660 already displayed many of the qualities—personal charm, conversational brilliance, scientific interest, ineffectiveness as a speaker, and basic selfishness—which became apparent in his later reign. Davies argues convincingly that Charles did not become a Catholic until he was *in extremis*, but also shows that the young king remained personally unattached

to all religious parties and that his Anglicanism was a policy of prudence. The study of James II is an inquiry into the swift change in Tory-Anglican attitudes toward Stuart government between 1685 and 1688, and therefore is based on Tory evidence. Davies notes that James' original policy was to rely on Anglican loyalty, secure indulgence for Catholics, and continue persecution of Nonconformists, and only later did he seek to attach Nonconformity by a broad toleration policy. Davies' account of James' downfall follows usual lines: he challenged the Englishman's reverence for the Church, devotion to law, and hatred of a standing army (stirring memories of Cromwell's Ironsides). The essay on William III's conduct of foreign affairs displays the difficulties and mistakes of the Dutch statesman in an unfamiliar constitutional setting. William jealously sought complete personal control of foreign policy in this critical era, seldom taking ministers, parliament, or nation into his confidence. In this he was motivated partly by the need of secrecy but fundamentally by his distrust of England's understanding of the dangers from Louis XIV. Only at the very end of his reign did he change approach, explain policies to parliament, and reap the reward of co-operation.

A bibliography of Davies' writings attached to this volume forcefully demonstrates his mastery of the period and sharpens regret that he was not permitted to continue the study of Charles II on which he had begun work.

J. F. MACLEAR
University of Minnesota (Duluth)

European Origins of the Brethren: A Source Book on the Beginnings of the Church of the Brethren in the Early Eighteenth Century. Compiled and translated by DONALD F. DURNBAUGH. Elgin, Illinois: The Brethren Press, 1958. 463 pp. \$4.75.

The Church of the Brethren was founded in 1708 at Schwarzenau in Wittgenstein. In the early nineteen-fifties, in anticipation of its two hundred and fiftieth anniversary, the

Church requested Donald F. Durnbaugh to compile a source book on the European beginnings. The resultant book, compiled with the aid of Hedda Durnbaugh, a native Austrian, is divided into six chapters, bearing the titles "Separation," "Formation," "Expansion," "Suppression," "Emigration," and "Publication." Durnbaugh has provided a helpful Introduction, and a copious Index adds to the value of the book.

The value of this book for the student of Brethren history is very great. Its intrinsic worth probably will be judged according to the bias of the reader. If one holds Emanuel Hirsch's position regarding the radical Pietists and that conglomerate which found refuge with Henry Albert, the count of Sayn-Wittgenstein-Hohenstein, he will wonder why anyone would want to recall this material from its well-deserved obscurity. To those who, *nolens-volens*, stand in this tradition, who are able and willing to assert that the Gospel has been mediated to them through this "Church," though they may regard certain features of this heritage as needing to be overcome, this book meets a long-felt need.

Heinz Renkewitz and Friedrich Nieper had previously studied certain phases of the Brethren beginnings, and Durnbaugh admits a real debt to their work. Nieper had dealt with the Brethren in the Lower Rhine area, and Renkewitz carried out thorough research on the radical Pietist, Ernest Christopher Hochmann von Hochenau. Hochmann, who had been a friend of Gottfried Arnold, probably wielded more influence on the little group of Pietists at Schwarzenau than any other person. Certainly it was through him that Arnold's position was mediated to the Brethren, and this was a position which they took unto themselves.

In the initial chapter, Durnbaugh brings together a great many of the pre-1708 documents which demonstrate the intensive attempts on the part of the officials to stamp out the Pietist nuisance. The attempts were unsuccessful. Some of the radical Pietists had left the established Church,

and sought no other. Hochmann retreated from the world to a simple hut at Schwarzenau, where he lived as an ascetic. But Alexander Mack and his seven confreres, influenced though they were by Hochmann, believed that obedience to Christ required baptism (they had, of course, rejected infant baptism), and in 1708 the eight went to the river Eder, drew lots to see who would baptize Mack, and then he in turn baptized the other seven.

The ensuing reaction was predicted by Hochmann. Pressures from many sides were brought to bear on Count Henry, without changing his determination to protect these and other Pietists. In a letter to his brother-in-law, he declared that "you may investigate only when you can show authority and instruction therefor from the emperor and the entire empire" (p. 132). Count Charles Louis replied with an accusation that these "fanatical and heretical people of low and knavish extraction" seemed to be "repeating the history of Jan van Leyden, Knipperdölling, and Thomas Müntzer and his consorts" (p. 133).

The activities of the twenty-five years that followed, until the last Brethren migration to America in 1733, occupy the main bulk of the book. Briefly, the story is one of some expansion, of attempted suppression, and finally of emigration. In 1719, 1729, and 1733, the Brethren left Europe for the safety of Penn's sanctuary. By the latter date all those whose present descendants trace organic connection to the Schwarzenau group were in America. Two small existing groups, one in Schwarzenau, the other in Denmark, claim some relationship with the "Schwarzenau Eight," but the former group is more aligned theologically with the movement of John Nelson Darby, and the centuries have obscured any ties with the latter.

The final chapter contains two of the longer writings of Alexander Mack and the first tiny hymnal composed by the Brethren. Mack's writings show the unmistakable influence of the thought of Arnold, and this position has dominated the "untheological" the-

ology of the Brethren almost to the present. Therein, perhaps, lies the greatest contemporary significance of this source book: it makes imperative for the Church of the Brethren the answering of the question as to whether the Arnoldian ecclesiology—or perhaps the lack of it—makes possible a valid interpretation of the Gospel. In any case, it is a rich gain for the Church of the Brethren to be able to survey its past in a way that has hitherto been impossible, and Durnbaugh deserves high commendation for his careful and competent work.

G. WAYNE GLICK

Franklin and Marshall College

The Humanitarian Movement in Eighteenth-Century France. By SHELBY T. McCLOY. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky Press, 1957. 274 pp. \$6.50.

Professor McCloy, author of the widely known *Government Assistance in Eighteenth-Century France*, here offers what in many ways is its sequel, by turning to an investigation of the question of Protestant disabilities and toleration; the Jewish question; the antislavery movement; demands for reform of prison conditions and of legal procedures in criminal law; child and youth welfare; public health; and pacifism and peace schemes. In considering these subjects, the author first sketches out the conditions that invited reform, then describes the reform movement as it found expression in the pamphlets, journals, books, and speeches of the period, and finally turns to the enactment of the reforms themselves either prior to or during the first stages of the Revolution.

The degree of interest shown for humanitarian reforms in France, he believes, was greater than anywhere else in the eighteenth-century world. Indeed, he maintains that the demands for such reforms "never have . . . been so numerous or widespread as to rival the humanitarianism [in France] of the 1700's." (p. 263) His researches, based upon a prodigious amount of reading in the contemporary literature, lead him to the conclusion that "these same re-

forms would almost certainly have come about in time without the Revolution. Some would have come earlier than others, but all were on their way." (p. 5) Although the Revolution greatly accelerated their enactment, Professor McCloy shows clearly that in some cases the revolutionists created chaos in their haste (notably in slave emancipation). Moreover, the Revolution gave rise to more immediate and more pressing problems which made it impossible for revolutionary governments to consummate their plans for public education, public health, or child welfare, or to observe in prison and legal matters the ameliorations which they themselves had established. He also points out that appeals to humanity frequently could be used by eighteenth-century writers as a weapon against changing the status quo. "As oddly as it may seem, [opponents to any amelioration in the status of the Jew or to emancipation of the Negro slave] declared repeatedly that they, too, were motivated by humanitarianism. . . . Idealism was the common atmosphere of both [friends and foes of change]." (pp. 79-80)

As for the Catholic Church in France, Professor McCloy finds it "shocking that the clergy had so negligible a part in advocacy of reform. They represented a religion and a church that stood for brotherly love, but they were largely indifferent to the injustices of the age. Here and there, indeed, a priest stood forth and dared to speak, like Fénelon, the Abbé de Saint-Pierre, and the Abbé Grégoire, but they were relatively few. Happily it can be said that there were many priests humane at heart and that in the National Assembly many voted for the cause of reform." (pp. 4-5) It should be observed, however, that Professor McCloy cites among the reform writers of the period (in addition to those mentioned above) the activities of Talleyrand, of Fathers Robert, Labat, and Mignon, and the Abbés Quesnel, Morellet, Prévost, Guénée, Mulot, Raynal, Martin, and Sieyès. He also shows that a sizable number of clerical cahiers in 1789 revealed humanitarian

leanings, and although he is correct in emphasizing the almost universal hostility of the clergy to Protestant emancipation, he is not completely accurate when he calls attention to "the reactionary character of all the clerical cahiers [of Languedoc] on the Protestant Question." (p. 41) The clergy of Castres were not completely indifferent to the plight of the Protestants, and those of Nîmes (which was the center of a very large and active complex of Protestants) were significantly silent on the Protestant question. Outside of Languedoc, the clergy of Cotentin, in an expression of tolerance of Protestants, represented another exception to the general rule. It might also be observed that the number of Protestants sitting as deputies in the National Convention, rather than being ten (p. 50), was at least as high as twenty-nine if the four Lutherans among them are counted. But these are minor points, and it must be said that this is a useful and valuable work, one long overdue in the field.

BURDETTE C. POLAND

Pomona College
Claremont, California

Jonathan Edwards The Preacher. By RALPH G. TURNBULL. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1958. 192 pp. \$3.95.

Jonathan Edwards has been discovered by many different scholars in many different ways. He has been pictured as a repristination of Calvin and as a sort of naturalist, as a Puritan mystic and as a Berkleyan idealist-with-modifications; in short, most treatments of him have treated segments of him rather than the whole personality. This book is no exception. It deals with Edwards as a preacher and is an effort to reassert the importance of Edwards' preaching for an understanding of the whole man, and to correct the caricature of Edwards' sermons which views them as mainly vindictive and sulphurous. The book shows wide reading and includes a fine bibliography.

The sermons of Edwards are examined in this book through the eyes of

a skillful and effective preacher. The chief appeal of the book will be to preachers. The very construction of the book reminds the reader of sermons, divided as it is into thirty short chapters, each with a short, text-like quotation from Edwards' writings. These quotations are well selected to reveal aspects of his character and thought. Dr. Turnbull repeatedly uses the material to illustrate good practise for preachers. The reader is encouraged to follow Edwards' habits of wide reading, note-taking, diligence in sermon preparation, and carefulness in thought. One could wish at this point for a fuller treatment of the profound integrity of these sermons. There is a sense of reality in them which is related to Edwards' consistent and meaningful view of the universe. This is in sharp contrast to the useful but shallow sermons which are found in every period, including our own. Dr. Turnbull provides an important service in classifying Edwards' sermons into Dogmatic, Imprecatory, Evangelistic, Ethical, Memorial, Vocational, and Pastoral. One sermon of each type is subjected to further analysis in outline form.

One insight deserves special mention. Edwards' famous sermon, "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," when preached at Enfield, had most unusual and extreme effect. The same sermon had been preached earlier in the church at Northampton with *no* unusual results! This is a vivid illustration of the importance of the expectancy of the congregation in effective preaching.

The continuity of the book is somewhat marred by the many separate topics which are treated. In the reviewer's opinion, the book would have been more useful had there been fewer chapters and had the most central matters been treated more fully. There are many topics of interest to students of Edwards which are dealt with very briefly or not at all in this book. Its value is in its examination of Edwards *as a preacher*, a fact which cannot be overlooked in the study of the man. The main utility of the book is for preachers who may yet have some

lessons to learn from one of America's master preachers.

J. STAFFORD WEEKS

*Huron College,
Huron, South Dakota.*

The Journals of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg. Translated by THEODORE G. TAPPERT and JOHN W. DOBERSTEIN. Volume III. Philadelphia, Pa.: The Muhlenberg Press and the Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania, 1958. 797 pp., including index to Volumes I-III. \$10.00.

Anyone familiar with the first two volumes of Muhlenberg's journals will welcome this third and final one, both for its content—covering the decade from 1777, and for its index—offering several hundred thousand entries and making the patient record of one man's life the link to many more. John Christopher Kunze's hope, affectionately expressed to his venerable father-in-law, has been amply fulfilled. "Your memory," he ventured to write Muhlenberg, "will never die in America, and I hope posterity will read much concerning you" (June 14, 1784. II, 596).

Twenty-three years after the work was first undertaken by the gifted team of Tappert and Doberstein, the lifetime log of this so-called patriarch of Lutheranism in North America is now complete in English translation. As recently as 1954 the last five manuscript volumes were recovered which span the final two years of his life and shed light on the years 1780-85. Besides, two additional fragments came to light at Halle, behind the Iron Curtain, even after this third volume had gone to press, one covering most of May, 1772; the other, parts of July-August, 1773. These fragments are promised for publication later in "some convenient periodical."

What we have here, however, is a rich lode of social as well as spiritual ore. The 45 recorded years yield a wealth of information not simply about a faithful and surprisingly effective colonial pastor, but especially about the people among whom he worked and whom he sought to gather into the

Church. With a striking combination of candor and forbearance, the journals are an intensely human document and a mirror of colonial society. The story involves Europe and America, and the colonies from Nova Scotia to Georgia. For most of it the hub is Philadelphia. In this final volume it reaches its poignant climax in thoughts on revolution and war, on the fears and failings of men, and on the future big with responsibility. It was April 16, 1783, Wednesday in Holy Week, that Muhlenberg set down in quaint but characteristic contrast the momentary and the momentous:

Lovely weather. The news is that the peace is to be proclaimed in Philadelphia today. O sublime Saviour of the world, give us that true peace which the world cannot give! The world's peace is generally plaited of sand so long as there is no rest in our bones [Ps. 38:3]; for there is only one Lord whom the winds and the sea must obey. When He speaks, it is done. In the evening young Ewald brought a wagonload of lime from Mr. Stier, of Whitemarsh. Had time to do some reading. (III, 537).

With one son, Peter, distinguished as a clergyman-turned-general, and another, Frederick, influential as a member of the Continental Congress, the elder Muhlenberg was carried forward, even against his will, by that painful process which brought forth a new nation. In the four years that remained to him after 1783, he could look back on a ministry involving much travel, administration, care of congregations, counseling and training of pastors, plus concern for numberless individuals. His report on the revolutionary era to his old friend in Sweden, Magnus von Wrangel, onetime provost of the Swedish Lutheran congregations in the Delaware valley, reveals how deeply Muhlenberg could appreciate the contribution of others. Without flattery he could write: "Your Reverence came as a doctor of theology and provost from the European Palestine to the American Egypt. . . . [You] mastered the English and German languages so quickly that you proclaimed the comforting gospel in the power of the Spirit . . . and adorned it with an exemplary life" (III, 622-23).

Muhlenberg's timidity toward people

was balanced by a bold faith that gave him a peculiar effectiveness, and qualified him to provide leadership in making the Lutheran church at home in a society of Anglo-Saxon institutions and a democratic way of life. Historians, however, will find in these journals something which transcends all sociological data and directs attention to a firm theological commitment. With all his foibles and faults, there was humor as well as piety in the man, and a vivid sense of the power of God in creating a new society. So it was typical that his last entry, little over a week before his death, should deal with new life: "September 29 [1787], Saturday. Baptized Anna, infant daughter of Joh. Frey and his wife Hanna. The child was 15 months old. The parents were sponsors" (III, 751).

One cannot lay this weighty volume aside without a final word of gratitude to the skill and patience with which the translators, and others, have labored to bring forth an *opus magnum* of first importance among the source books of colonial history, and also to the Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania which under-wrote the costs. This third volume, like its predecessors, is even now a collector's item.

E. THEODORE BACHMANN

*Pacific Lutheran
Theological Seminary.*

They Gathered at the River, The Story of the Great Revivalists and their Impact upon Religion in America. By BERNARD A. WEISBERGER. Boston and Toronto: Little, Brown & Co., 1958. xii, 345 pp. \$5.00.

Revivalism is generally regarded as a distinctively American phenomenon, and so it is in some of its important features. John Wesley did pretty well as a revivalist, and so did some of the English eighteenth-century Evangelicals such as Rowland Hill. Still, it is true that the conditions of American society, the precarious position of churches without prestige or support derived from establishment, and the mutations of even orthodox theology in

America gave American revivalism a character not known elsewhere. It has followed not a constant but a changing pattern. The author's purpose is to describe the patterns as they appeared in successive periods, to show how they were related to the movements of thought and the character of the times, and to portray the personalities and procedures of the most conspicuous revivalists down to and through the period of Billy Sunday.

It is not easy for a sophisticated and scholarly observer to treat all aspects of revivalism with the respect that the movement as a whole deserves, for it has had some bizarre and fantastic features. It has exhibited some "primitive traits," as Davenport demonstrated half a century ago. The author successfully avoids interpreting the whole in terms of its least admirable parts. The title of the book, with its slightly tongue-in-cheek flavor, made me a little apprehensive—but quite possibly the publisher dreamed it up. Good publishers are very ingenious in coining catchy titles. If the sensitive reader discovers in the early pages a few passages with a similar flavor, he need not be worried. The author is not out to debunk revivalism but to write a serious and thoroughly documented history of it, letting the chips fall where they may. The documentation is, indeed, magnificently meticulous. If his interpretations are critical, they are always intelligent and never contemptuous. He has no scorn for anyone who tried to preach the gospel and "save" men, however limited may have been the concepts of gospel and salvation.

The successive stages in the development are stages in theological change as well as in revivalistic technique. The Great Awakening, with Frelinghuysen, Whitefield and Edwards, was solidly Calvinistic. The Great Western Revival, though Presbyterian in origin, based its appeal on the proposition that "Christ died for all," not for the elect only. Both stressed the act of God in conversion; it was something the Holy Spirit did to the individual—and with powerful manifestations in the Kentucky and Tennessee revival. A revival

of religion in the east in the early years of the nineteenth century was primarily directed against the current deism which had been the fruit of the Enlightenment in England and France, and toward making nominal Christians real Christians. Asahel Nettleton, the first American "professional specialist in revivals," stressed doctrinal preaching, as did his contemporaries Timothy Dwight and Nathaniel Taylor. Charles G. Finney, trained in law and not in theology, came nearer than anyone else since Whitefield and Edwards to setting the country afire with zeal for salvation. He took the Bible as the Christian law book and declared that it was man's responsibility, and within his power, to repent of his sins and accept Christ. Moody, with even less theology than Finney and with equal confidence in the competence of the human will to make the great decision, was business man turned evangelist. He simplified the message and complicated the method. That is to say, he began the process of developing organizational techniques for getting results. Such theology as he had was thoroughly conservative. His generous mind was untroubled by the fact that some Christians believed in evolution and had "new views" of the Bible, but these things had no place in his thinking. He could team up with the deeply devout evolutionist Henry Drummond, and he was less disturbed by the belief of some that there were two Isaiahs than by the ignorance of others that there was even one. His revivals were all "union meetings."

These features have characterized all conspicuously successful revivalists from Moody's day to ours: a simplified but always conservative theology, a completely uncritical use of the Bible, disregard of denominational fences, the assumption that by an act of his will any man *can* repent, accept Christ and be saved, and an elaborately contrived organization to prepare the way, conduct the campaign, and count heads to give statistical proof of its success. (Moody never did count his converts, and his organization was elementary compared with, say, Billy

Graham's.) After Moody, and conspicuously with Billy Sunday, lambasting the sins of society became part of every popular revivalist's stock in trade.

Beginning not long after the Civil War it became standard practice at least in the middle west for almost every congregation to have its own revival or "protracted meeting" every year, with nightly preaching for two or three weeks. Conducting such revivals became a profession to which hundreds of evangelists devoted their full time. The author recognizes this type of revivalism, but he might well have given it more attention, for in the aggregate it probably bulked larger than the work of the "great" revivalists. These, however, furnished the models that the others followed.

This book is a thoroughly excellent treatment of an important strain in the history of American Christianity.

WINFRED E. GARRISON
University of Houston

Religion and Learning at Yale: The Church of Christ in the College and University 1757-1957. By RALPH GABRIEL. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958. 271 pp. \$4.00.

American history, if conceived as a many-storied building, has very few "stairways" or institutions which run from basement to the top floor and which the historian can climb with an eye to studying the subtle and complicated interactions between personality, event, idea, and institution. Yale and Harvard are two of the most significant of such stairways. It is no accident, therefore, that our ablest historians have written about these schools: Samuel E. Morrison's history of Harvard, George Williams' study of the Harvard Divinity School, Roland Bainton's book on Yale Divinity School, George Pierson's two volumes of Yale University history, and now a superb and compact study of Christianity at Yale by Professor Emeritus Ralph Gabriel.

The book's sub-title is "The Church of Christ in the College and University, 1757-1957." This church, formed

under the imprimatur of Yale's early Rector, Thomas Clap, is the oldest college church in the country. An autonomous member of the New Haven Association of Congregational Churches, this congregation currently worships in Battell Chapel on the Old Campus. The photographs of the various chapels and of the remodelling done within Battell over the course of eighty years comprise in themselves an interesting mirror to religious and educational change. The Yale church has been shepherded by such Presidents as Ezra Stiles and the Timothy Dwights, by such scholars as Benjamin Bacon, by such a pastor and collegiate paterfamilias as Sidney Lovett. Professor Gabriel, himself a Yale graduate and one of its greatest teachers, is, as any reader of *Church History* would immediately recognize, superbly equipped to write this cultural history of Yale. At the end of his pen one watches puritanism change, decay, take on new form and life. Through the chapel window Gabriel shows us the impact of Voltaire, Silliman, Paley, Nathaniel Taylor, Henry Drummond, John Fiske and a host of other greater and lesser men and ideas.

One case in point is Gabriel's engrossing description of what happened when textbooks in Scottish common-sense moral philosophy were studied by students who listened to long Edwardian sermons while preparing for citizenship in a land dominated by the democratic ethos of the 1830's. Another such profile is the author's description of that maelstrom of unreconciled convictions found by the Yale Christian student of the 1880's when surrounded by the frowning providence of Noah Porter, the ethic of Spencer, and the iconoclasm of William Graham Sumner's lectures in sociology. Or again, Gabriel writes of his own pre-World War I undergraduate days, describing the Northfield Conferences led by Mott and "Weeping Bob" Speer—conferences to which Yale inevitably sent the largest delegation. It was an era when Christianity was interpreted in terms of simple moralism and sentimentalized evangelism, but withal

marked with a very impressive personal integrity.

No college in our country surpasses Yale in the number, quality, and variety of Christian leadership which it has nurtured: names such as Jonathan Edwards, the Dwights, Billy Phelps, Kenneth S. Latourette, E. Fay Campbell, Henry Sherrill, Henry S. Coffin, Morgan Noyes, William Borden, Charles Campbell, Sherwood Eddy, George Stewart, Henry Wright, Sidney Lovett. And that sampling of names comes only from the undergraduate college, not to mention the Divinity School. Gabriel has a wealth of material, both historical and anecdotal, to draw upon. But he did not write nostalgic memorabilia for the sons of Eli; he has written a splendid and readable case-study of the relation between community and faith, between conviction and person, between old piety and new learning. He did well to write it, and we will do well to read it.

WALTER WAGONER

*Rockefeller Brothers
Fellowship Program*

Homeward to Zion. By WILLIAM MULDER. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1957. 375 pp. \$7.50.

Well-known is the fact that hundreds of thousands of Scandinavian immigrants poured through Castle Garden into the new world of hope and promise in the last half of the nineteenth century. Not so well-known, however, is the fact that some 30,000 of these immigrants (who remained) came here as Mormon proselytes. Profiting from their experience in Great Britain, which was visited by Mormon missionaries as early as 1837, the apostles soon gained a foothold in Denmark after arriving there in 1849. The work in Sweden and Norway went somewhat more slowly, and Copenhagen continued as the center of Mormon activity in the North (nearly half of the converts made were Danes).

We are not surprised to learn that the State-church pastors and the constables often harassed their work, but, as Mulder puts it, "the elders were un-

abashed." Native converts, drawn for the most part from among the laboring classes, proved to be the most effective Mormon missionaries in Scandinavia. Many of these returned to their homelands temporarily after emigrating to Utah, and they enjoyed notable success. One Swedish official was led to remark that "the kingdom is beleaguered by this missionary army from Utah."

A total of 46,497 converts was made by the year 1905, and most of these emigrated as quickly as possible. "Raising means to go to America became the great preoccupation of the faithful. There was no magic carpet." The Perpetual Emigrating Fund, run from Salt Lake City, was "the heart of the system," the means by which this "bootstrap redemption" was carried out. The arrival in the Great Salt Lake Valley was for the saints "the high point" in their lives, and once there they learned that there was no emigration fund from Utah.

Nearly one-third of the converts recanted, some at home, others after reaching Zion. Many of those who were disillusioned after seeing the promised land made it their business to return home and warn others of the "dog's life" in Utah. The evils of polygamy, e.g., were carefully detailed. But most of the converts went to Utah and remained, and of these the author reports that they were "readily absorbed into the corporate Zion." There were no exclusively Scandinavian colonies in the Mormon domains, where the "fellowship overrode ethnic distinctions." As covenant people who had come 5,000 miles and more to Zion, the Scandinavian immigrants proved their zeal for the new way of life by often going "beyond the common forms of cooperation endemic in the Mormon society." But most drew the line at the doctrine of "celestial marriage," which involved the practice of polygamy. Not many cooperated in this aspect of Mormon life, and those who did usually took no more than 2 wives (Brigham Young took 27).

This entire story, as Oscar Handlin puts it in a brief Foreword, "is a fasci-

nating chapter in the history of migration and of the settlement of the American West." I concur in that judgment. But I must also say that I believe Dr. Mulder made one serious mistake: I feel that he should have acknowledged, somewhere in his book, the fact that he has written from within the Mormon tradition. It is no doubt true that the author's "strong Mormon background" (I here quote the Minnesota Press) has done much to equip him to interpret and explain the Mormon ethos, but at the same time, I sensed that this same emotional involvement also did something to color his attitude, particularly in discussing Mormon-"gentile" relationships. If he had mentioned this involvement, I am sure that most of the people who study this book would forgive him for the occasional subjective "slips" which intrude here and there; most of them, as seen in the total configuration of the book, are of a rather minor nature. But without knowing that this book was written by a man with a Mormon orientation, some people may draw the wrong conclusions in reading certain parts of the unfolding story.

Thus, for example, in discussing the attempts of the American churches to win the Mormons (back, in many cases) to Christ, Dr. Mulder lumps the missionaries and "the malcontents" together. The women of the churches concerned were "insistent busybodies." A New York clergyman "wailed" when he learned that the railroads were doing the Mormon cause more good than was expected. The author's treatment of the Lutheran missionaries in Utah appears particularly biased. The Lutherans, to take Mulder's word for it, sought only to "unsettle" the immigrants whom the Mormons had "planted." The Mormons are credited with helping the immigrants "break with the past" (is that necessarily good?); the Lutheran attempt to turn them back to the old church was "futile longing." The Lutheran congregations did not grow very fast, we are told, because they offered a "gnawing discontent" rather than an "illuminating faith" as the bond of fellowship.

Other examples could be produced. They do not spoil the story, but they do serve to transform, in some places, an historical account into something of a muted apologetic. I am of the opinion that this would have been a better book without the dispensable subjective lapses. But in spite of them I can honestly recommend this work to all who are interested in the migration epics, the Mormons, Scandinavians in America, and so on.

GENE LUND

*Concordia College,
Moorhead, Minnesota*

The Presbyterian Valley. Edited by WILLIAM WILSON MCKINNEY. Pittsburgh: Davis and Warde, Inc., 1958. xix, 639 pp. \$3.95.

The "Valley" is that of the Upper Ohio, or more exactly, that region of western Pennsylvania, eastern Ohio, and the northern panhandle of West Virginia of which Pittsburgh is the cultural and economic focus. This is "the most densely Presbyterian" of any comparable region in the country, and the present volume consists of a collection of historical essays designed to explain how it got that way.

Seven authors have contributed, most of them pastors. Their work was organized and developed over nine years by the Presbyterian Historical Society of the Upper Ohio Valley, which must be one of the more impressive of such local societies in the nation. A full third of the volume was written by the editor, and his six chapters constitute the backbone of ecclesiastical development. Into Dr. McKinney's narrative are inserted four chapters on missionary expansion by Dr. Welsh, and four on education, one on the Western Theological Seminary by Dean McCloy, and three by Dr. Guthrie on academies and colleges. The remaining third of the chapters were supplied by Messrs. Moser, Swetnam, and Yolton. Nearly three fourths of the space is devoted to the history from the French and Indian War to the reunion of 1870. The period since 1870 receives no comprehensive treatment.

Not all the chapters are equal in value and the several authors repeat each other a good deal. Some sections are overly full in promoting this or that college or congregation, and lists of philanthropists, military officers, famous women are more suited to a commemorative volume than a digested history. But there is a solid core of such history, often grounded on theses at Western Seminary or the University of Pittsburgh. The treatment of the earliest churches, of "temperance" and anti-slavery agitation is especially full, along with that of the educational enterprise. To write of the slavery controversies in this area without mentioning the Lane story is something of a tour de force, but by way of compensation we get an unusually full account of the Free Presbyterian movement. There is surprisingly little on the history of theology, even when the four or five varieties of Scots Presbyterians are in question, or the Cumberland and New School controversies, and the fundamentalist issue is barely mentioned. But the conservatively pro-management economic and political orientation of Pittsburgh Presbyterianism in recent decades is frankly and critically viewed.

Financial subsidy by friends of the enterprise has made possible the remarkable price for a very handsome and substantial book, illustrated with scores of portraits and other cuts, with maps on the end-papers, and supplied with full bibliographies, notes, and index as well as several appendices.

J. H. NICHOLS
University of Chicago.

The Baptist Church in the Lower Mississippi Valley, 1776-1845. By WALTER BROWNLOW POSEY. Lexington (Kentucky): University of Kentucky Press, 1957. 166 pp. \$5.00.

Professor Posey has contributed three volumes on the religious life of the old Southwest: Methodists, Presbyterians, and, now, the Baptists. The Baptist story is told for the years between 1776 (first Baptist preaching service west of the mountains) and 1845 (the division in Baptist ranks

over slavery, and the formation of the Southern Baptist Convention).

The book is based on considerable reading in the sources and is helpfully documented. For those who have some acquaintance with its subject, an imaginative reading of the Epilogue would communicate the substance of the book.

The remarkable growth of the Baptist movement in the Lower Mississippi Valley is traceable to three historical factors. The growth began with an influx from Virginia and the Carolinas of Baptist people into Kentucky and Tennessee. The growth was sustained by the suitability of the people to the region and its culture. Here was a plain, unlettered people, carrying on its work in a crude environment. The Baptist concern for freedom, democratic procedures, etc., also appealed to the spirit of the times and the place. Rapid expansion followed upon the evangelistic efforts put forth in the early camp meetings, and their later modification in the "protracted" meeting.

Most of the frontier preachers were unlearned, laboured under no homiletical inhibitions, and, on occasion, supported the notion of an *ignorantia sacra*. Only gradually did education increase among them—partly as salaries began to be paid them, making possible the gaining of educational opportunities.

The early Baptist churches maintained a strict, if somewhat legalistically conceived discipline. Sexual lapse, drunkenness and non-attendance upon services seem oftenest to have been under ban. At any rate, there was by such means a tension maintained between church and world, and a non-conformist body had not yet begun, through the very force of success, to transform itself into a *Volkskirche*.

Missionary concern and action were the overflow of the activity of Luther Rice and the Triennial Convention, which had come into existence largely through Rice's efforts. Anti-mission activity, in which Daniel Parker was most prominent, threatened the missionary spirit for a time. The tide was turned

again, however, before the middle of the nineteenth century.

The slavery issue had, it would seem, more impact on the churches than the churches on slavery. Earliest Baptists in Kentucky had been opposed to slavery, though there seems to have been more sentiment and idealism than decision and action. As the issue became one of national proportions, the Baptists tended to reject responsibility for it; and finally, as regional and economic interests came to predominate, slavery was defended by many on scriptural grounds.

Two formal factors contributed most, I should say, to the development of Baptist life in the time and place under review. The first was the growing concern for education, showing itself in the founding of numerous colleges, publication societies, and the like. These raised the cultural level of Baptist leadership, and, in doing so, helped to change the ethos of Baptist life. The second was the elaboration of the associational principle, and its extension in state conventions. This changed slightly in form, and vastly in fact, the Baptist understanding of the absolute independence of the local church.

The book is a good and useful chronicle of facts and events. If the facts and events were probed for their dynamic relation to culture and faith, the book would be both more valuable, and more interesting to read. Nonetheless, it is competent in what it attempts, and it merits study.

Theron D. Price

Wornall Road Baptist Church
Kansas City.

The Emergence of Liberal Catholicism in America. By ROBERT D. CROSS. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1958. ix, 328 pp. \$5.50.

Robert D. Cross has walked in where many a religious historian has feared to tread. Everyone who has seriously studied the theological life of Catholicism in the United States during the past seventy years has been disturbed by the conflict between the Americanizers and those Catholic leaders who

were fearful of American civilization. Some writers have not hesitated to designate the second group as conservatives or as "foreign" nationalists, but only the opponents of the Americanizers dared to call the first group "liberals." Their opponents called them liberals in the sense that liberals were reprobated by the *Syllabus of Errors* of Pope Pius IX. Efforts were made by the Americanizers to distinguish between Liberal Catholicism and Liberal Catholics, a distinction which Dr. Cross understands since he shows that the Liberal Catholics rejected modernism and radical religious departures. To counteract the charge of religious liberalism, the Americanizers preferred the term "Americanists" or perhaps just "Americans." Dr. Cross, like some disinterested non-Catholic observers of the 1890's, simply calls these men "liberals" and their policies "liberalism." Actually he never defines his meaning of liberalism but by implication he seems to indicate by that term the acceptance of American political, social, and economic civilization by religious persons.

In discussing the European background, Dr. Cross finds a distinction between liberals and conservatives among the Catholics in western Europe in the debate over the acceptance or rejection of the democratic way of life during the nineteenth century. The ideas expressed by Lamennais, Montalembert, Dupanloup, and their followers were generally opposed by the more conservative Catholic thinkers of southern Europe. Pope Pius IX seemed to shift from the liberal side to the conservative after the invasions of Rome by Mazzini, but Leo XIII seemed to support the more liberal thinkers. Somehow when the battle was transposed to the United States there was never any real question of an American monarchy. But American civilization was considered by many of the conservatives as socially radical and irreligious, if not anti-religious.

In Catholicism in the United States, the problems of the acceptance of the French Revolution and of the Temporal Power of the Pope took second place

to the problems of separation of Church and State, public schools, the Church and science, and cooperation with non-Catholics in civic and social enterprises. Dr. Cross indicates the leaders in the two groups and their opinions on these topics. By discussing these topics separately for the nineteenth century, he mixes up a bit the chronological sequence without, however, seriously affecting the exposition of the ideas of the contenders. He has relied almost entirely on magazines and books and does not portray very sharply the personalities that were more clearly seen in the extant correspondence and in the weekly Catholic press.

In general Cardinal James Gibbons, Archbishop John Ireland, Bishop (later Archbishop) John J. Keane, and Bishop John Lancaster Spalding accepted American civilization as fully compatible with Catholicism and urged full Catholic participation in the life of the land. They accepted constitutional provisions for ecclesiastical disestablishment, recognized the necessity and the advantages of the public school while desiring Catholic schools, and held that Catholics must cooperate in the political and social life with non-Catholics for the good of the nation. They fostered Catholic higher education and Catholic activity in science and expected Catholics to assume their proper place in the political life of the country. The conservative group, holding to the ideal of a complete Catholic civilization, preferred a policy of abstaining from those activities which could not be made Catholic. Somehow, while insisting that they were very American because they found American ideals perfectly consonant with their theories, they did not want to associate in any thing which would be neutral or non-Catholic. They insisted on a complete system of Catholic education, Catholic labor unions, and completely Catholic societies, and held back from cooperation in any social activities in which Catholics would be on an equal basis with members of other religions or in a minority. There were also personal rivalries and ecclesi-

astical politics involved in these divisions of the clergy and people. The conservatives indignantly denied that they were less American than the liberals and insisted that the liberals had wrongly assumed the name of Americans.

There was a European reaction to this American controversy when Archbishop Ireland and his associates tried to help the liberals in France by suggesting that the French follow American ways. By caricaturing the Americanizers in studies of the previously published life of Father Isaac Hecker, and the speeches of Ireland, Keane and their European associates, the European conservatives created an "Americanisme" which received papal condemnation. Pope Leo XIII, however, explicitly stated in the document of condemnation that he was not speaking of American civilization proper but only of the picture drawn up by these controversialists.

Dr. Cross continues his study into the twentieth century. Some of the younger men of the earlier battles lived on, but the heat of the controversy was cooled down by the papal letter of January 1899 and the subsequent argument over modernism. The liberals received new leadership in Father John A. Ryan and Father William Kerby, who were formulators of the Catholic reconstruction program after World War I. But Dr. Cross should have indicated that this chapter is a post-script to his real study, since he is not prepared to discuss twentieth century American Catholicism. As a matter of fact, very little of even the spade work has been done on this period. The habits of the Roman archivists of holding back for a hundred years before releasing documents may be correct in centuries-old Europe, but it has a handshackling effect on American students who regard a hundred years as a long time. Dr. Cross has done a thorough bit of research and has let his materials speak for themselves. At the same time, he has given encouragement to those Catholics who are very optimistic about the future of

Catholicism in America.

THOMAS T. McAVOY, C. S. C.
University of Notre Dame.

Walter Rauschenbusch: Ein Beitrag zur Begegnung des Deutschen und des Amerikanischen Protestantismus. By DR. THEOL. REINHART MÜLLER. (Oekumenische Studien I Herausgegeben von Prof. Dr. Ernst Benz) Leiden/Köln: E. J. Brill, 1957. x, 129 pp. 14.50 guilders.

The first full-length monograph on Rauschenbusch in the German language, this is likewise the first of a projected series of ecumenical studies to emanate from the Ecumenical Study Center of the Theological Faculty at Marburg. It is fitting that it should appear at a time of renewal of interest in the great American prophet, for one of the author's purposes is to demonstrate Rauschenbusch's significance in the development of the ecumenical movement. Müller studied at Marburg and subsequently on a World Council of Churches stipend in the United States where he made excellent use of virtually all Rauschenbusch materials. He is currently pastor of the German Evangelical Church in Mexico City.

A discerning biographical sketch clarifies the somewhat obscure ramifications of Rauschenbusch's familial and pietistic inheritance from six generations of German pastor-ancestors. Müller is also concerned to show how largely Rauschenbusch was influenced not only by the German social-evangelical movement and his years of study in Germany but by his life-long connection with the sponsors of the *Christlichen Welt*, by his own Marburg residence, and by his friendship with Martin Rade (the appendix includes two letters from Rauschenbusch to Rade) and other members of the Marburg faculty.

The body of the book comprises a systematic presentation of Rauschen-

busch's thought, set forth against the background of its development in the crucible of the Hell's Kitchen pastorate, the Brotherhood of the Kingdom, and the influence of socialism. These formative forces in the life of Rauschenbusch, familiar to American scholars, are properly assessed. Müller understands Rauschenbusch's attitude toward socialism ("practical not theoretical"): "God had to raise up socialism because the organized church was too blind, or too slow, to realize God's ends." Müller is rightly critical of Visser t'Hooft for considering Rauschenbusch a liberal, "which he never was." His conclusion that Rauschenbusch is difficult to pigeonhole theologically is a common-sense one, resting as he did upon the dual heritage of German pietism and American evangelical fervor, as these were tested in the social cauldron of his age.

As intended, the work will of course serve well to introduce Rauschenbusch to German readers; virtually an anthology, it properly includes many lengthy quotations from all the major sources plus frequent abstracts of obscure sources, including an interesting German version of "The Postern Gate." Müller believes Rauschenbusch to be an important force in the making of the ecumenical movement, citing as an example of pervasive rather than specific influence his social interpretation of the Lord's Prayer as utilized by a speaker at the Stockholm Conference of 1925 and comparable evidences of the terminology of social concern to which Rauschenbusch gave currency as these appeared at subsequent ecumenical gatherings. Müller also reminds us of the importance of the translation of certain of Rauschenbusch's works into eight foreign languages.

C. HOWARD HOPKINS
*Westminster Choir College,
 Princeton, N. J.*

BEACON PRESS

25 Beacon Street
Boston 8, Mass.

**Of Particular Interest to
Readers of Church History**

*Two Important Studies
on the Left Wing
of the Reformation*

THE FREE CHURCH

\$6.00

by **FRANKLIN HAMLIN LITTELL**
*Professor of Church History
at Emory University*

"Franklin Littell . . . has done a great service to church leaders by his deep insight and his helpful analysis of what the free church is and its importance to the American religious tradition."
—*Mennonite Life*.

**THE ANABAPTIST
VIEW OF THE CHURCH**

*Revised and Enlarged
Second Edition*
\$6.00

A classic in its field, winner of the Brewer Prize of the American Society of Church History.

"Perhaps the most important single volume in print for both the specialist and the general reader."
—*George Huntston Williams*, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Harvard Divinity School.

Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, 1258-1282

A STUDY IN BYZANTINE-LATIN RELATIONS

By **DENO JOHN GEANAKOPOLOS**. A fully documented account of the life and career of Emperor Michael VIII provides the brilliant foreground for this first book-length treatment of underlying problems in the relations of Byzantium and the Latins, Eastern and Western Christendom, during the later Middle Ages. Illustrations. Maps. \$7.50



Through your bookseller, or from

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

79 Garden Street, Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

CHURCH AND PARLIAMENT

The Reshaping of the
Church of England, 1828-1860

Oliver J. Brose

This is the first modern, objective study of the Church of England's struggle against disestablishment in the nineteenth century, a struggle that resulted in a Church-State relationship that has remained substantially the same up to the present day. Emphasis is placed upon the political context in which the reshaping of the Establishment took place, and on the roles of Sir Robert Peel and Bishop Blomfield as creators and shapers of the policy. The prolonged struggle over education strikingly illustrates the essential ambiguity of a national church in a society that was no longer church-centered.

\$5.00

SAINTS IN ARMS

Puritanism and Democracy
in Cromwell's Army

Leo F. Solt

The widely held view that even in Puritanism the fount of democratic thought is challenged in this investigation of the ideology of the chaplains in Cromwell's New Model Army. Examining the relationship of the chaplains' religious views to political concepts of freedom and authoritarian government, the author concludes that "authority took precedence over liberty, power over law, millenarianism over separatism, sainthood over equality, grace over covenant, and assembly over elective polity." The eloquence of the Leveller ideas set forth around army campfires at Putney in 1647 has led to a tendency to regard them as characteristic of the whole Puritan movement. The author re-examines this contention in an effort to put the theme of Puritanism and democracy in a more proper historical perspective than has prevailed in the past.

\$4.00

STANFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
Stanford, California

